

BERENGARIUS' NOTION OF BODY
AS IT AFFECTED HIS
DOCTRINE OF EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE

By

Sister Mary Peter McGinty, C.S.J., B.A., M.A.

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School, Marquette University in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

1967

BERENGARIUS' NOTION OF BODY AS IT AFFECTED
HIS DOCTRINE OF EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE

Of the various ways in which Christ is really present among Christians, there is one presence which is unique: the eucharistic presence under the appearances of bread and wine. It seems feasible to begin a study of eucharistic presence with the precise problem of the relation of body to presence at the point where the problem arose, the eleventh-century controversy. Undoubtedly at the center of the dispute was the belief of Berengarius of Tours. In his teaching, Berengarius was resisting the popular belief that the eucharistic body was physical flesh to be touched, broken, and chewed. In contrast, Berengarius brought out the concept of spiritual eating of the body of Christ, with an insistence on the sacramental nature of the eucharistic body. It was inconceivable to him that the body of Christ, now risen, could in any way be divided or corrupted. He could not accept a notion of substantial presence of the body of Christ. For Berengarius, if the body of Christ was to be present substantialiter, it would have to be present as it was in itself. But, for him, the body of Christ as it was in itself was located in heaven at the right hand of the Father. He had no concept of a spiritualized body which can actually be present as it is in itself and yet not be visible or in any way sensibly perceptible. This lack of knowledge as to the nature of body, in particular of the risen body of Christ, narrowed Berengarius' understanding of eucharistic presence. But it did not necessarily falsify his belief in the reality of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

Understanding Berengarius' doctrine requires recognition of his

notion of sacrament, involving a clear distinction between the thing signifying and the reality signified. It is also necessary to realize Berengarius' idea of a risen body. For him, the risen body of Christ as material, visible, tangible, is localized in heaven. This is the natural condition of the reality: a divine person expressed in a human nature which is itself expressed in human flesh. This body in its natural expression is beyond the reach of man's senses but it is not therefore unreal or unknowable to man. For Christ himself designated the physical elements of bread and wine to provide, as does human flesh and blood, the point of contact whereby the man of faith communicates with the man who is God. In fact, from the evidence of the text, it can be said that Berengarius does not deny the real presence, nor reduce it to a dynamic symbolism, nor to a mere symbolic relationship. Rather, he tries to use reason to reach a clearer understanding of a fact he accepts on faith: the bread and wine after consecration are the body and blood of Christ.

The procedure of the study is first of all to note the intellectual and political milieu which nourished the thought of Berengarius; secondly, to examine briefly the challenge of Lanfranc, both as to method and to doctrine, as it is expressed in his De corpore et sanguine Domini. The main section of the study analyzes the text of De Sacra Coena in an attempt to elucidate Berengarius' idea of real presence as it is influenced by his concept of sacrament and of body. From this information, it is then possible to draw some conclusions concerning the extent to which his notion of body influenced his idea of real presence.

2

PREFACE

Current theology, stimulated by the liturgical renewal and the documents of Vatican II, emphasizes the central role of the Eucharist in Christian life. Paul VI approves and encourages the efforts of theologians "to investigate this lofty mystery, to set forth its inexhaustible riches, and to explain its meaning to the men of today."¹ One of the more interesting results of this effort has been a clarification of the presence of Christ in his Church.² Of the various ways in which Christ is really present among Christians, there is one presence which is unique: the eucharistic presence under the appearances of bread and wine.³ Any attempt to explain this presence immediately confronts the problem of the relationship between body and presence.⁴ It is a question

¹Paul VI, Encyclical Letter Mysterium Fidei, AAS 57(1965), p. 766; Eng. tr. by National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C., 1965, 14.

²Ibid., 35-39: "Christ is present in His Church when she prays. . . . He is present in His Church as she performs works of mercy. . . . He is present in the Church on her pilgrimage. . . . He is present in the Church as she preaches. . . . He is present in His Church as she rules and governs the People of God. . . . Christ is present in His Church when she offers the sacrifice of the Mass. . . when she administers the sacraments. . . . Christ is present in His Church in the sacrament of the Eucharist."

³Ibid., "It is presence in the fullest sense: because it is a substantial presence by which the whole and complete Christ, God and man, is present."

⁴Ibid., 46: "Christ, whole and entire, in His physical 'reality' is also bodily present, although not in the same way that bodies are present in a given place." Cf. J. Powers, "Mysterium Fidei and the Theology of the Eucharist," Worship 40 (1966), pp. 17-35.

which merits investigation with the purpose of providing the possibility for a deeper understanding of the union attained between Christ and the Christian in the action of the Eucharist.

It is a task of theology to scrutinize the past, to examine what actually was said in the light of a particular historical situation, in an effort to discover the many influences which have contributed to our present understanding of a doctrine. Such studies serve to give a freshness and vigor to the eternal truths of faith.

This study returns to a particular point in the history of the doctrine of eucharistic presence to examine the effect of a specific notion of body on the understanding of real presence. Finding that the concept of body had a definite effect on the understanding of eucharistic presence in the teaching of an eleventh-century scholar, theologians of today may make use of current philosophical studies on the meaning of body in their attempt to explain the mystery of the Eucharist to the men of today. It is to be hoped that this analysis of the De Sacra Coena of Berengarius of Tours will contribute in some measure to this end.

It is with deepest appreciation that I mention here those who have been of special help to me during these years of study. I wish to express my gratitude to the Board of Trustees of Marquette University and to the Arthur J. Schmitt Foundation for scholarship aid. I extend my thanks to the staff of the Interlibrary Loan Department of Marquette Memorial Library. I am grateful to Father John Sheets, S.J., Father William Kelly, S.J., and Father Paul Stockhausen, S.J. for reading the manuscript. It is also a pleasure to thank Doctor Richard Schneider for

his critical reading of the manuscript, and Sister Florence Marie Gerdes, C.S.J. for her careful reading of the Latin text. I am deeply indebted to Father Bernard Cooke, S.J. for his unfailing interest and patient understanding in directing this dissertation. Finally, I owe sincere thanks to my religious superiors and my community for their constant encouragement and support as well as for the opportunity of studying at Marquette University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	x
INTRODUCTION	1

PART I

THE STATE OF THE QUESTION AS BERENGARIUS ENCOUNTERED IT

Chapter

I.	BELIEF IN THE REAL PRESENCE UP TO THE TIME OF BERENGARIUS . .	12
	- Early Church - Fourth Century - Carolingian Era - Eleventh Century	
	Conclusions	
II.	INFLUENCES IN THE FORMATION OF BERENGARIUS' THOUGHT	35
	- Intellectual Milieu - The Schools - Dialectics - Chartres - Berengarius, Scholasticus of Tours - Dominant Influences - Augustine - Erigena - Ratramnus - Political Pressures	
	Conclusions	
III.	THE CHALLENGE OF LANFRANC	75
	- Method - Authority - Use of Texts - Dialectics - Doctrine - Sacrament - Reality Signified (<u>res</u>) - Real Presence - Change - Body	
	Conclusions	

2

PART II

THE RESPONSE OF BERENGARIUS AS SEEN IN THE DE SACRA COENA

IV.	THE METHOD OF BERENGARIUS IN THE <u>DE SACRA COENA</u>	101
	Authority	
	Use of Texts	
	Role of Reason	
	Argumentation	
	Language	
	Conclusions	
V.	THE MEANING OF SACRAMENT (<u>SACRAMENTUM</u>) FOR BERENGARIUS . . .	144
	Definition	
	Visibility of Sacrament	
	Relation of Sacrament to Reality Signified (<u>Res</u>)	
	Role of Consecration	
	Effect of Sacrament	
	Conclusions	
VI.	BERENGARIUS' USE OF THE TERM BODY OF CHRIST (<u>CORPUS CHRISTI</u>)	168
	Properly Speaking (<u>propria locutione</u>)	
	Figuratively Speaking (<u>tropica locutione</u>)	
	Distinction of Flesh (<u>caro</u>) from Body (<u>corpus</u>)	
	As the Reality Signified (<u>res sacramenti</u>)	
	As the Term of Consecration	
	Conclusions	
VII.	BERENGARIUS' DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST	191
	Consecration and Change	
	Presence of Bread after Consecration	
	Presence of Body after Consecration	
	Conclusions	
VIII.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	212
	APPENDIX	222
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	228

ABBREVIATIONS

<u>AAS</u>	<u>Acta Apostolicae Sedis</u>
<u>Denz</u>	Denziger, <u>Enchiridion Symbolorum</u>
<u>DCSD</u>	Ratramnus, <u>De corpore et sanguine Domini</u>
<u>DHGE</u>	<u>Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique</u>
<u>DSC</u>	Berengarius, <u>De sacra coena</u>
<u>DTC</u>	<u>Dictionnaire de théologie catholique</u>
<u>MedSt</u>	<u>Medieval Studies</u>
<u>PG</u>	Migne, <u>Patrologia Graeca</u>
<u>PL</u>	Migne, <u>Patrologia Latina</u>

INTRODUCTION

The presence of Christ in the Eucharist is the central reality of Christianity. Herein lies the cause and the expression of the life which creates and sustains the people of God on earth. The fact of the real presence of Christ is not questioned within the Christian community; the manner and meaning of this presence have been and are often misunderstood. Actually, the understanding of eucharistic presence is but one aspect of the broader question of the real presence of Christ to men. As recent studies have pointed out, Christ is really present in a variety of ways. Even within the one action of the Mass he is present in the liturgical assembly, in the person of the priest who offers the sacrifice, under the eucharistic species, in the sacramental actions, and in his word as it is proclaimed through the Scriptures.¹ In each case, there is a real presence of Christ. But, in each case, the manner of presence differs. It is not the purpose of this study to investigate the broad question of real presence; it is rather an historical study: an attempt to clarify to some extent the relationship of body to presence as it was seen at a critical time in the evolution of the doctrine. The result

¹Cf. The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council, AAS 56 (1964), 7; Eng. tr. by Paulist Press, Glen Rock, N.J., 1964. Also E. Schillebeeckx, "Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration," Worship 40 (1966), p. 328: "the real eucharistic presence cannot be isolated from the real presence of Christ in the whole liturgical mystery and in the souls of the faithful." Also G. Baum, "The Manifold Presence of Christ at Mass," The Ecumenist 3 (1965), pp. 69-72; P. Schoonenberg, "Christ's Eucharistic Presence," Chicago Studies 5 (1966), pp. 135-152.

may serve to enrich the understanding of eucharistic presence.

Current thought sees the type of presence involved in the Eucharist as an interpersonal relationship: the offering of self on the part of one person with a corresponding acceptance and response from the other person. It is a self-communication which, when brought to fulfillment, results in communion of spirit, the most profound and total presence possible to men.²

This personal presence involves bodily expression revealing the identity and the intention of the one to the other. A relationship between human persons is established through bodily communication; whether it be by word or gesture or by the total surrender of one's body to another. Christ offers the most profound personal relationship to men, expressed in the Eucharist by word and sign and complete self-surrender, as he says: "This is my body, which is given for you."³

The problem of presence, and specifically the problem of eucharistic presence, is thus closely linked with the understanding of body as the external manifestation, the means of communication, the instrument of action for the reality we call a human person. Man is essentially spirit; yet, he is incarnate spirit: inner reality expressed through a body. Christ, in becoming man, took on human identity, his divine person being expressed in the language of a human body. The divine reality is embodied in human flesh. God is present to man in a way which permits a deep personal relationship. The human body of Christ provides the means

²Cf. Jean Mouroux, The Meaning of Man, New York, 1961; J. Sarano, The Meaning of the Body, Philadelphia, 1966; K. Rahner, The Church and the Sacraments, New York, 1963; G. Fessard, La dialectique des exercices spirituels de saint Ignace de Loyola, Paris, 1956.

³Luke 22:19.

of communication and of union.

Throughout his life, and specifically in his death and resurrection, Christ offered to man a total union in love. The giving of his body is a sign of the complete surrender of self which constitutes the fulfillment of love. The union which results incorporates man in the person of the Son: God shares with man his own divine life. The human body of Christ in itself manifests the divine goodness by revealing the person of the Son. Christ added a further revelation of divine love by giving his body for men, thus offering to man the most profound personal union, the sharing of life in communion of spirit. The individual man thus united to Christ--the Christian--becomes the embodiment of the divine reality, the visible means of communication and of union.

In the Eucharist, Christ continues this offering of self signified in the giving of his body. Indeed, the body of Christ is central to the meaning of the Eucharist. That body, now raised to glory, is beyond the limitations of space and time; beyond the realm of human sensitivity. But Christ has designated the physical elements of bread and wine as the visible expression and instrument of his gift of self. By the power of his word, earthly food is transformed into spiritual nourishment. The body which reveals the divine person in his saving action among men retains the sensible characteristics of bread and wine. Christ is present as he is in himself; his body is present as it is in itself; the reality is expressed visibly in sign. In the eucharistic action, bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ, the embodiment of the divine reality, the means of communication and of union.

The precise meaning of the statement that the eucharistic bread

is the body of Christ has been the subject of much theological speculation. The fact is accepted on faith by Christians, but explanations and understandings of the fact vary. In such a case, historical studies can do much to clarify the basic problem and to point out the occasions or causes of diversion. The occasions of diversion were usually also the occasions of explicitation of dogma by the Church. There is a two-fold benefit to be realized in a recognition of the specific errors involved, and in a fuller insight into the defined truth when its definition is seen in its proper historical context.

Such motives have led to a consideration of the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist as it was viewed in the eleventh century. The first real confrontation of the question took place at that time.⁴ Was the eucharistic body a physical body to be touched and chewed; or was it a mere symbol capable of effecting a subjective presence; or was it truly the body of Christ which was born, suffered and died, and was raised to the right hand of the Father? Inquiring minds were seeking an explanation of the relation of sign to reality in the Eucharist.

At the center of the controversy was the teaching of Berengarius of Tours.⁵ Representative of flourishing scholastic thought, Berengarius was opposed by leading monastic scholars for his attempts at a rational explanation of the faith. Both the method of applying reason to faith, and the meaning of eucharistic faith became more precise as a result of

⁴A brief history of the doctrine of real presence is given in Chapter I of this study.

⁵Details concerning this eleventh-century scholar of the cathedral school of Tours are presented in Chapter II of this study.

reaction to Berengarian thought. Important to the purpose of this study is the fact that, from the time of Berengarius, the emphasis in eucharistic faith was on the objective presence of the body of Christ. Subsequent centuries saw the rise of such practices as the elevation of the host, benediction of the blessed sacrament, and Corpus Christi processions. The eucharistic presence of the body of Christ became almost an end in itself, instead of a means to union.⁶

Also pertinent to this study is the fact that in his teaching Berengarius was resisting the popular belief that the eucharistic body was physical flesh to be touched, broken, and chewed. In contrast, Berengarius brought out the concept of spiritual eating of the body of Christ, with an insistence on the sacramental nature of the eucharistic body. He denied at every opportunity that the body of Christ could be spatially, sensibly present. It was inconceivable to him that the body of Christ, now risen, could in any way be divided or corrupted. He could not accept a notion of substantial presence of the body of Christ. To Berengarius, if the body of Christ was to be present substantialiter, it would have to be present as it was in itself. But, for him, the body of Christ as it was in itself was located in heaven at the right hand of the Father. He had no concept of a spiritualized body which can actually be present as it is in itself and yet not be visible or in any way sensibly perceptible. This lack of understanding as to the nature of body, in particular of the risen body of Christ, narrowed Berengarius' understanding of the eucharistic presence. But it did not necessarily falsify his belief in the reality of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

⁶Much of the history of the Eucharist is available in the works of such scholars as Jungmann, Battifol, Gregory Dix, and pertinent articles in the DTC.

Studies of Berengarian thought have reached varying conclusions concerning his belief in the real presence. The most comprehensive study is that of A. J. Macdonald published in 1930.⁷ His stated purpose in writing of Berengarius was "to show that a strong Augustinian or Evangelical tradition existed all through the early Middle Ages until its defeat at Rome in 1079, when Berengar was finally condemned."⁸ The practical conclusion to be drawn is that "the Evangelical interpretation of eucharistic doctrine, put forth by the Reformed Churches, does not merely issue from Reformation times, it is no mere teaching of yesterday, but has a long and honourable history from the Apostles to Berengar."⁹ This "Evangelical interpretation" is a dynamic symbolism "expressing a change of value in the elements after consecration, which produced an effect upon worthy recipients."¹⁰ Macdonald attributes to Berengarius such a doctrine: "that consecration produces the effect of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist."¹¹ Reception of the eucharistic bread produces a spiritual effect on worthy recipients, as if the body of Christ were truly present. There is no objectively real presence, but rather the value of the body and blood of Christ.¹²

A widely accepted interpretation of Berengarius' doctrine is that it expresses a merely symbolic presence of Christ. M. Cappuyns, in an excellent article in the Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie

⁷A. J. Macdonald, Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine, London, 1930.

⁸Ibid., p. viii.

⁹Ibid., p. ix.

¹¹Ibid., p. 230.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 246.

¹²Ibid., p. 259; 261.

ecclésiastique,¹³ points out Berengarius' rejection of any kind of material, sensible presence of the body of Christ. He refers to Berengarius' insistence on a spiritual presence, an intellectual presence, a figurative presence.¹⁴ Cappuyns concludes that for Berengarius it is not a question of an application of Christ's merits, but a suggestion, by means of symbol, of what Christ is for us and wishes us to be. Between the real Christ and the Eucharist, there is only a symbolic relationship: an actually existing object and the figure of that object.¹⁵

Among the reasons given for Berengarius' "heresy", the most commonly accepted one is his dialectical approach to a mystery of faith. Among his contemporaries, Gozechin, Lanfranc, and Guitmund all accused Berengarius of excessive use of reasoning in matters of faith.¹⁶ In present day scholarship, Macdonald claims that dialectics is the principle

¹³M. Cappuyns, "Bérenger de Tours," DHGE, v. 8, col. 385-407.

¹⁴Ibid., col. 403.

¹⁵Ibid., col. 404. Current theology leaves the question open: "Berengarius is a tragic figure of transition. He refutes the physical conception which his adversaries present of Christ's presence as not only philosophically impossible, but also as unworthy of the glorified state of Christ. But on the other hand, Berengarius does not succeed in fully understanding the symbolic texts of Augustine. It is a contested point whether Berengarius admits for our cognitive powers more than a reference to Christ. It is true that he attributes a salutary power to the Eucharist and to each of the sacraments, but it remains unclear whether this is a real communion with the person of the Lord." Schoonenberg, Chicago Studies 5 (1966), pp. 142-143.

¹⁶Gozechin, Epistola ad Valcherum, 31, PL, 143, 901; Lanfranc, De corpore et sanguine Domini, 17, PL, 150, 427; Guitmund, De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate in Eucharistia, 1, PL, 149, 1427.

of Berengarius' theology.¹⁷ Charles Sheedy, in a study of the eleventh-century controversy, maintains that Berengarius approached the Eucharist almost exclusively from the dialectical point of view.¹⁸ Nevertheless, Sheedy considers the basic error of Berengarius to be a false metaphysical principle: Berengarius did not make the philosophical distinction between substance and accidents, and therefore failed to realize the possibility of an inner change of reality without a corresponding external change.¹⁹ In a different approach, one of the leading medieval scholars of our day, N. M. Haring traces the origin of Berengarius' heretical thinking to a false analogy between baptism and the Eucharist, whereby the change wrought in the material elements is considered to be the same in both instances: "the substance of bread and wine remained as much unchanged as the substance of water."²⁰

There has been no attempt on the part of scholars to investigate the effect of Berengarius' concept of body on his belief in the real presence. Yet, this approach seems to offer a clearer understanding of his thought. Analysis of Berengarius' teaching in the light of his theological and intellectual background produces indications of a true

¹⁷Macdonald, Berengar, p. 250.

¹⁸Charles Sheedy, The eucharistic controversy of the eleventh century against the background of pre-scholastic theology, Catholic University, Studies in Sacred Theology, 2nd series, No. 4, 1947, p. 33.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 12.

²⁰N. M. Haring, "Berengar's Definitions of Sacramentum and their Influence on Medieval Sacramentology," MedSt 10 (1948), p. 144.

concept of the real presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist. There is evidence for a belief in the presence of one and the same reality, visibly expressed by the historical body of Christ in heaven, and by the eucharistic body of Christ on the altar. The reality is the same; the expression differs.

Understanding Berengarius' doctrine requires recognition of his notion of sacrament, involving a clear distinction between the thing signifying and the reality signified: the visible is an indication of the invisible. It is also necessary to realize Berengarius' idea of a risen body. For him, the risen body of Christ as material, visible, tangible, is localized in heaven. This is the natural condition of the reality: a divine person expressed in a human nature which is itself expressed in human flesh. This body in its natural expression is beyond the reach of man's senses but it is not therefore unreal or unknowable to man. For Christ himself designated the physical elements of bread and wine to provide, as does human flesh and blood, the point of contact whereby the man of faith communicates with the man who is God. In fact, from the evidence of the text, it can be said that Berengarius does not deny the real presence, nor reduce it to a dynamic symbolism, nor to a mere symbolic relationship. Rather, he tries to use reason to reach a clearer understanding of a fact he accepts on faith: the bread and wine after consecration are the body and blood of Christ.

It is the purpose of this study to clarify the relationship of the concept of body to the belief in eucharistic presence as it was expressed in a specific historical controversy and as it is seen in the

teaching of one man, Berengarius. The procedure followed is to first place Berengarius in historical context by examining the belief in the doctrine up to his time, as well as the intellectual milieu and political pressures which shaped his thought. The particular occasion which drew Berengarius into controversy is clearly stated in the work of Lanfranc which is examined insofar as it presents a challenge to Berengarius as to his method and his doctrine. The second part of the study is directly concerned with the eucharistic teaching of Berengarius as expressed in his De Sacra Coena. The main point of emphasis is the fact that sacramental presence, presence in figure, involves expression in designated species of the same reality that is otherwise expressed in its own natural species. This is brought out in a consideration of Berengarius' teaching concerning change and presence. Through consecration, the eucharistic species take on a new relationship to the heavenly body. Both express one and the same reality: Jesus Christ. Both are really the body of Christ.

PART I

THE STATE OF THE QUESTION AS BERENGARIUS ENCOUNTERED IT

CHAPTER I

BELIEF IN THE REAL PRESENCE UP TO THE TIME OF BERENGARIUS

In the year 1215, the four hundred bishops assembled under Innocent III at the twelfth ecumenical council of the Church issued a profession of faith. It contains the affirmation and definition of the Christian belief in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and in the fact of transubstantiation: "his body and blood are truly contained in the Sacrament of the Altar under the species of bread and wine, transubstantiated by the divine power--the bread into his body and the wine into his blood."¹ This brief statement was the culmination of two centuries of intense controversy. Neither aspect of eucharistic faith had been called into question prior to the eleventh century. Thus it was that in the intervening centuries the constant belief of the Church was brought to clarity, and the words used to express that belief were given more definite meaning. The conciliar statement resulted. No longer could the question be asked: does the Eucharist really contain the body and blood of Christ?

Early Church

In the first three centuries of the Church, such a question had not arisen. The Fathers accepted and professed the dogma of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist based on the belief of the faithful,

¹Denz. 430: "cuius corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transsubstantiatis pane in corpus, et vino in sanguinem potestate divina." The notion of truth (veritas, verum, vere) is important to this study and is worked out in Chapter IV.

the testimony of Scripture, and the living witness of the liturgy. It was in fact the central point of early eucharistic teaching.²

The early liturgy speaks of the bread and wine as "holy," as spiritual food which communicates immortal life.³ For Ignatius of Antioch, there is no doubt of the reality of Christ's bodily presence: "the eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father, of His goodness, raised up again."⁴ The bread is the flesh of Jesus, the cup his blood: "I desire the bread of God, the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God."⁵ So, too, Irenaeus, in refuting the Gnostics and Docetists, claims that the bread and wine are really the Lord's body and blood: "He took that created thing, bread, and gave thanks, and said, 'This is My body.' And the cup likewise, which is part of that creation to which we belong, He confessed to be His blood."⁶ Tertullian's realism is evident in the assertion that the converted pagan "feeds on the richness of the Lord's body, that is, on the eucharist."⁷ He further argues that in the Eucharist "the flesh

²For a summary of the early history of the doctrine of the real presence, see the development of G. Bareille, "Eucharistie d'après les Pères," DTC, 5-1, 1121-1183; J. Quasten, Patrology, 3 v., Westminster, Md., 1964; P. Battifol, Etudes d'histoire et de la théologie positive; l'Eucharistie, la présence réelle et la transubstantiation, Paris, 1930.

³Didache, 9,5; 10,3.

⁴Ignatius of Antioch, Epistle to the Smyrneans, 7, 2; PG 5, 713A.

⁵Ignatius of Antioch, Epistle to the Romans, 7, 3; PG 5, 693B.

⁶Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, 4, 17, 5; PG 7, 1023C.

⁷Tertullian, De pudicitia, 9; PL 1, 1051A.

feeds on Christ's body and blood so the soul may be filled with God."⁸ Cyprian asks that the martyrs be strengthened "with the protection of Christ's body and blood. . . . For how do we teach or provoke them to shed their blood in confession of His name, if we deny to those who are about to enter on the warfare the blood of Christ."⁹

The Greek Fathers are equally realists. Chrysostom speaks of eating Christ, even of burying one's teeth in his flesh.¹⁰ The wine is identically that which flowed from the side of Christ; the body is that which was nailed to the cross.¹¹ Cyril of Jerusalem gives the clearest statement of the real presence: "Contemplate therefore the bread and wine not as bare elements, for they are, according to the Lord's declaration, the Body and Blood of Christ; for though sense suggests this to thee, let faith establish thee. Judge not the matter from taste, but from faith be fully assured without misgiving, that thou has been vouchsafed the Body and Blood of Christ. . . . That what seems bread is not bread, though bread by taste, but the Body of Christ; and that what seems wine is not wine, though the taste will have it so, but the Blood of Christ."¹²

Acceptance of the fact of the real presence is indeed evident. Yet, no didactic treatise on the Eucharist is to be found in patristic writings, simply because the belief of the Church was not menaced by false teaching on this point. Then, too, the Christological doctrine,

⁸Tertullian, De resurrectione carnis, 8; PL, 1, 852A.

⁹Cyprian, Epistle to Cornelius, 57, 2.

¹⁰John Chrysostom, In Joannem homilias, 46, 3; PG, 59, 259.

¹¹John Chrysostom, In I Corinthians homilias, 24, 1-4; PG, 61, 197-204.

¹²Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechesis mystagogica, 4, 9; 4, 6; PG, 33, 1104BC; 1101A.

on which eucharistic faith depends, was not explicitated until near the end of the patristic era. Appropriate terminology of well-defined and accepted usage was lacking, with consequent imprecision of expression and confusion of interpretation. For example, the Fathers spoke of nature, substance, and essence as natural properties; they used terms such as symbol, figure, image, type, whose meaning was only to be clarified little by little. In the liturgy, the mysteries are described as "antitypes (ἀντίτυπα) of His precious body and His blood"; Christ's death is commemorated "by virtue of the symbols (συνεσώλων χάριν) of His body and blood." Yet, the formula at communion is "The body of Christ (σῶμα Χριστοῦ); . . . The blood of Christ (αἷμα Χριστοῦ, ποτήριον ζωῆς)."¹³ Serapion speaks of "offering this bread" as a "likeness (ἐμσίμωμα) of the body," and "offering the cup" as a "likeness of the blood."¹⁴

The Fathers, too, despite the expressions of realism we have seen, used language which seems to imply a merely symbolical use of the terms body and blood. Tertullian refers to the bread as a "figure" (figura) of Christ's body, and also speaks of "the bread by which he represents (repraesentare) his very body."¹⁵ It is to be noted that there is in ancient thought a mysterious relationship between a symbol and the thing symbolized; the symbol in some sense is the thing symbolized.¹⁶

¹³Apostolic Constitutions, 5, 14, 7; 6, 23, 5; 8, 13; PG 1, 873C; 973A; 1110A.

¹⁴Euchologion of Serapion, 13, 12-14.

¹⁵Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem, 3, 19; PL 1, 376B; Adv. Marc. 1, 14; PL 1, 287A; (cf. n. 47 on repraesentare); de monogamia, 10; PL 1, 992-993.

¹⁶Cf. G. van der Leeuw, Religion in Essence and Manifestation, New York, 1933; M. Eliade, The Sacred and the Profane, New York, 1958; J. Chydenius, The Theory of Medieval Symbolism, Helsingfors, 1960.

There is also a vocabulary in which the verb repraesentare means "to make present."¹⁷ It can therefore be said that Tertullian is merely expressing the sacramental manner of presence.

The Greek Fathers use similar language, but out of a different background, characterized by a strong tendency to allegory and to a Platonic view of reality. Thus, Clement states that to drink Jesus' blood is to participate in his incorruptibility.¹⁸ Allegory leads him to interpret feeding on the flesh of Christ as apprehending the divine power.¹⁹ Origen seems to distinguish two aspects in the sacrament: the corruptible matter and the incorruptible reality. He calls the consecrated bread the "typical (τυπικόν) and symbolical (σημαδιον) body," which is not as important as the Logos himself who is our food.²⁰ Cyril of Jerusalem indicates that the bread and wine remain such to sensible perception and are "the antitypes" of Christ's body and blood; "for in the figure of bread is given to thee His Body, and in the figure of wine His Blood."²¹ So, too, Athanasius clearly distinguishes the visible bread and wine from the spiritual nourishment they give.²²

Indeed, it would be difficult to categorize the Fathers as either

¹⁷Bareille, DTC, 5-1, col. 1153. Cf. J. de Ghellinck, Pour l'histoire du mot sacramentum, Louvain, 1924.

¹⁸Clement of Alexandria, Paedagogus, 2, 2, 20; PG 8, 409B.

¹⁹Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, 5, 10, 66; PG 9, 99C.

²⁰Origen, Commentariorum In Matthaeum, 11, 14; PG 13, 952A.

²¹Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechesis mystagogica, 4, 3; PG 33, 1100A.

²²Athanasius, Ad Serapionem, 4, 19; PG 26, 665C.

realists or symbolists.²³ The use of allegory, so prevalent among some of the Fathers, does not turn their eucharistic doctrine into symbolism but actually presupposes the real presence. They understood the words of institution literally and never seemed to feel they needed explanation or defense. God had said, "This is my body"; there was no room for doubt. Cyril of Jerusalem insists: "Since then He Himself has declared and said of the bread, 'This is My Body', who shall dare to doubt any longer? And since He has affirmed and said, 'This is My Blood', who shall ever hesitate, saying, that is not His blood?"²⁴ After the blessing or consecration, faith must take over where reason stops. In various ways, the Fathers affirmed that the Eucharist is undoubtedly, certainly, truly, really, properly the body of Christ.

It is the body of Christ which is received, affecting not only the soul of the receiver, but also his body; thus he partakes of incorruptibility and immortality. For Ignatius, it is "the medicine of immortality, and the antidote to prevent us from dying, . . . that we should live for ever in Jesus Christ."²⁵ The Fathers often refer to the Eucharist as an antidote to death, a remedy of immortality, a beginning of eternal life, a life-giving source; all effects of receiving

²³ Medieval thinkers have come to be classified as realist or not according to their explanation of the relation between thought and reality. Extreme realism held that "our generic and specific concepts correspond to a reality existing extramentally in objects, a subsistent reality in which individuals share." The adversaries of ultra-realism held that "only individuals exist. . . . General names have no general or universal objects corresponding to them." Ultra-realism is said to be a result of philosophizing as a logician, that is, of assuming that the logical and real orders are exactly parallel. F. Copleston, A History of Philosophy, v. 2, pt. 1, pp. 161-164. The position held would be of critical importance to a theological explanation of eucharistic presence.

²⁴ Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechesis mystagogica, 4, 1; PG 33, 1097A.

²⁵ Ignatius of Antioch, Epistle to the Ephesians, 20, 2; PG 5, 661B.

the flesh of Christ; all effects which imply the real presence of Christ.²⁶
 The effects become operative only if the flesh of Christ is eaten, only if a corporal union with Christ takes place. A spiritual union with Christ is possible in grace; corporal union is achieved in the Eucharist.

How the body of Christ becomes present is a question upon which the Fathers did not speculate to any extent. They knew that a change was necessary, for bread which was not the body of Christ is now that body. Justin refers to the change when he writes: "We do not receive these as common bread or common drink. But just as our Saviour Jesus Christ was made flesh through the Word of God and had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we have been taught that the food which has been eucharistized by the word of prayer from Him . . . is the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus."²⁷ Likewise, Irenaeus speaks of a change: "Just as the bread, which comes from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread but eucharist, being composed of two elements, a terrestrial one and a celestial, so our bodies are no longer commonplace when they receive the eucharist, since they have the hope of resurrection to eternity."²⁸

²⁶Further expressions indicative of this bodily presence are such as "d'entrer dans nos corps, de s'introduire dans nos corps, d'être reçu dans nos entrailles, d'être joint à nous corporellement, d'être en nous comme un médicament avalé, comme un plomb qui purifie un métal avec lequel on le fond, comme un feu qui agit sur de l'eau, comme un morceau de cire mêlé avec un autre, comme une étincelle qui se conserve dans de la paille, comme un levain mêlé dans de la pâte, . . ." Bareille, DTC, 1124.

²⁷Justin, 1 Apologia, 66, 2; PG 6, 428C.

²⁸Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, 4, 18, 5; PG 7, 1028B.

The Greek Fathers, too, recognize a change. Athanasius sees the prayers of consecration as the cause of the change: "So long as the prayers and invocation have not yet been made, it is mere bread and a mere cup. But when the great and wondrous prayers have been recited, then the bread becomes the body and the cup the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ."²⁹ Cyril of Jerusalem attempts to explain this change; he uses the verb "change" or "convert" (ΜΕΤΑΒΑΛΛΕΙΝ) to express the transformation (ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ) brought about by the Holy Spirit. He is the first to interpret this change in an understanding close to the sense of transubstantiation.³⁰ Gregory of Nyssa uses this idea of conversion to explain how the body of Christ can be received in its entirety and yet remain entire itself. He describes "the nature of the visible objects" as being "transelemented" (ΜΕΤΑΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΣΑΣ). This change would seem to be an alteration in the relation of the elements (στοιχεῖα) of bread and wine by which they acquire the "form" (εἶδος) of the body and blood of Christ.³¹ Chrysostom speaks of the elements as being refashioned (ΜΕΤΑΡΡΥΘΗΙΣΕΙΝ) or transformed (ΜΕΤΑΣΚΕΥΑΣΕΙΝ).³² And Cyril of Alexandria says that the visible objects are not types or symbols but have been transformed (ΜΕΤΑΠΟΛΕΪΤΑΙ).³³

Theodoret reacted against a monophysitic interpretation of

²⁹ Athanasius, ex sermone ad baptizatos, PG 26, 1325C.

³⁰ Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechesis mystagogica, 4, 2; 5, 7; PG 33, 1097B; 1116A.

³¹ Gregory of Nyssa, Oratio catechetica magna, 37; PG 45, 97C.

³² John Chrysostom, In Matthaeum homilias, 82, 5; PG 57, 744.

³³ Cyril of Alexandria, Commentariorum In Matthaeum, 26, 27; PG 72, 452C.

conversion; this led him into a dyophysite theory whereby the bread and wine remained in their own nature, mediating the nature of the body and blood. He claimed that after the consecration the bread and wine "remain in their former substance, appearance and form, visible and tangible as before."³⁴ To explain the effect of the consecration, he said that Christ, in designating the bread and wine as his body and blood, did not change their nature, but added grace to it. The substance was not changed but was made a vehicle of grace.³⁵

This theory was unique and in keeping with the Christological theory of Theodoret. For the Fathers of both the East and the West their eucharistic vocabulary did not signify a mere change of figure or sign, but a true, real, and positive change of substance.³⁶

Fourth Century

The Latin Church of the fourth century maintained the same belief in the real presence and the same idea of a change in the bread and wine. In Gaul, in Africa, and in Rome the same faith was evident.³⁷ A few specific passages from authors whose thought was dominant in the middle ages may be pertinent.³⁸

³⁴Theodoret, Dialogue II. Inconfusus; PG 83, 168C; Dialogus I. Immutabilis, PG 83, 53-56.

³⁵Theodoret, Immutabilis; PG 83, 55B.

³⁶"Les Pères qui en parlent le regardent comme la conséquence naturelle et nécessaire de ces paroles: 'Ceci est mon corps;' conséquence si claire et si obvie qu'ils n'ont pas senti le besoin d'expliquer ou de prouver la liaison qui la rattache à son principe et de dire: C'est le corps de Jésus-Christ, donc le pain est changé au corps de Jésus-Christ." Bareille, DTC, 1125.

³⁷For an exposition of the thought of representatives of each area, see Bareille, DTC, 1151ff.

³⁸Here we meet for the first time authors with whom Berengarius was familiar.

St. Jerome spoke as a convinced realist and justified the real presence by the words of Christ at the last supper. His preoccupation with the Scriptures led Jerome to apply the comparison between the Old Testament and the New Testament as figure to reality, to the bread and wine as figures of the Eucharist which is the actual reality: the relation between the bread and the body of Christ is like that between shadow and body, between image and truth.³⁹ For him, the Eucharist is the reality of which the paschal lamb and the sacrifice of Melchisedech were but figures: Christ fulfilled the Paschal type by eating the flesh of the lamb with his apostles; he then took bread, meant to comfort man's heart, and made of it the true sacrament of the Pasch. What had been prefigured in the offering of Melchisedech, the high priest of God, is truly represented in the offering of his body and blood.⁴⁰ The action of the last supper was an image expressing his passion in type.⁴¹ In this context the flesh and blood of Christ can be understood in two ways, spiritually or historically. Yet Jerome considered the body of Christ in the Eucharist or on the cross as identically the same body in different modes of being: the one passible, mortal and corruptible; the other

³⁹PL 26, 603C: "Tantum interest inter propositionis panes et corpus Christi quantum inter umbram et corpus, inter imaginem et veritatem, inter exemplaria futurorum et ea quae per ipsa exemplaria praefigurabantur."

⁴⁰PL 26, 202-3: "Postquam typicum Pascha fuerat impletum, et agni carnes cum apostolis comederat, assumit panem, qui confortat cor hominis, et ad verum Paschae transgreditur sacramentum, ut quo modo in praefiguratione ejus Melchisedech, summi Dei sacerdos, panem et vinum offerens fecerat . . . ipse quoque in veritate sui corporis et sanguinis repraesentaret."

⁴¹PL 23, 325A: "quod in typum suae passionis expressit."

glorious, impassible, and incorruptible.⁴²

The eucharistic teaching of St. Ambrose is clearly expressed in his De mysteriis,⁴³ wherein he proclaims the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, the same body that Christ received from the Virgin, the same flesh which was crucified. The presence of this body is guaranteed by the words of Christ, the same words of consecration. A true change, a real conversion makes this presence a fact. The sacrament is truly of this flesh, the true flesh of Christ which was crucified and buried. The Lord Jesus said: "This is my body." Before the blessing another species is named; after consecration the body is signified.⁴⁴ The historical body of Christ is really present by the transforming action of the word of God. And man can really participate in this body which is a real food, a spiritual food. Christ is in that sacrament, since it is the body of Christ. It is therefore not bodily,

⁴²So, too, "la chair et le sang des saints, tels qu'ils sont ici-bas, c'est-à-dire à l'état passible et corruptible, ne peuvent point posséder le royaume de Dieu, mais n'en verront pas moins le salut de Dieu dès que, par la résurrection, ils posséderont les qualités des corps glorieux; ils sont alia, mais la différence de leur mode d'être n'empêche nullement l'identité substantielle des corps des saints auxquels cette chair et ce sang appartiennent." Bareille, DTC, 1153-1154.

⁴³One of the best texts, with an excellent commentary, is Des sacrements. Des mystères, tr. B. Botte, Sources Chrétiennes, No. 25, Paris, 1949. PL 16, 389-410; 417-462.

⁴⁴De myst., 9, 53; Botte, p. 126: "Vera utique caro Christi quae crucifixa est, quae sepulta est, vere ergo carnis illius sacramentum est. Ipse clamat dominus Jesus: Hoc est corpus meum. Ante benedictionem verborum caelestium alia species nominatur, post consecrationem corpus significatur." De myst., 9, 30; Botte, p. 124: "Probemus non hoc esse quod natura formavit, sed quod benedictio consecravit majoremque vim esse benedictionis quam naturae, quia benedictione etiam ipsa natura mutatur."

but spiritual.⁴⁵

To read Ambrose is to meet again the problem of language. For his use of terms seems confusing unless his words are given a meaning consistent with their own context. Thus, he does not consider "nature" and "figure" as contradictory, but rather speaks of the "conversion of the nature" of bread and wine as he speaks of the "transfiguration" of the bread and wine. The verb transfigurare appears to be synonymous with convertere.⁴⁶ The idea of conversion is most characteristic of Ambrose. For him, the consecration effects an actual change in the elements (species mutet elementorum), which alters their natures into something they were not before.⁴⁷ Then again, the Eucharist is presented as an image of the truth (imago veritatis). For Ambrose, shadow (umbra) corresponds to the Old Testament, image (imago) to the New Testament and the Church, while the truth (veritas) resides in heaven. The faithful see divine realities in image, but the image is not empty or without objective reality. Compared to the symbols of the Old Testament, the Eucharist is veritas; but in relation to the vision to come, the liturgy is indeed an imago. By no means does

⁴⁵De myst., 9, 58; Botte, p. 128: "In illo sacramento Christus est, quia corpus est Christi. Non ergo corporalis esca, sed spiritalis est."

⁴⁶Ambrose used conficere as more than a synonym of consecrare; for him, it meant an action that produces a radical internal change. This is shown by the use of such terms as naturam mutare, naturam convertere, praeter naturam. For Ambrose, species equalled the reality as opposed to the similitude or appearance; he sometimes substitutes veritatem for speciem. S. Bonano, The concept of substance and the development of eucharistic theology to the thirteenth century, Catholic University, Studies in Sacred Theology, 2nd series, No. 121-A, pp. 27-28. Cf. L. Lavorel, "Oblats et corps du Christ sur l'autel d'après saint Ambrose," Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale 24 (1957), 205-224, for a study of these words.

⁴⁷De myst., 9, 51-53; Botte, pp. 125-126.

this imply that the Eucharist is merely an image without any reality or truth.⁴⁸

St. Augustine is often charged with being a symbolist in his eucharistic doctrine.⁴⁹ Yet there is sufficient evidence to show that he accepted the realism of his day. In fact, his symbolism is not a negation of the realism expressed in his works, but a result of his concept of sacrament. The eucharistic elements are a sign of the body of Christ, a sign which actually is the body and blood of Christ. He maintains that the bread which is seen on the altar, sanctified through the word of God, is the body of Christ. Through it the Lord wishes to commend his body and blood, which are given for us to the remission of sin.⁵⁰ In the sign there is an objective reality, unknowable to the senses, but uniquely accessible to the spirit by faith. This reality is the body of Christ, not in its natural form but under a spiritual form. The words of Christ must be understood spiritually; he did not mean that the body as it was seen on earth was to be eaten. Rather the sacrament is given to men; spiritually understood, it vivifies men. It must be

⁴⁸"la présence réelle, quoique invisible, du Christ dans l'eucharistie, et la participation à son corps et à son sang par la communion, bien qu'objet de foi, n'en sont pas moins une réalité." Bareille, DTC, 1156.

⁴⁹Cf. K. Adam, Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin, Paderborn, 1908; J. Geiselman, Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik, Paderborn, 1926; A.J. Macdonald, Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine, London, 1930.

⁵⁰PL 38, 1099: "Panis ille, quem videtis in altari, sanctificatus per verbum Dei, corpus est Christi. Per ista voluit Dominus Christus commendare corpus et sanguinem suum, quem pro nobis fudit in remissionem peccatorum." Cf. PL 42, 144.

celebrated visibly, but understood invisibly.⁵¹ This invisible yet real presence demands adoration of the sacrament. Since Christ walked in this flesh and gave this flesh to us to be eaten unto salvation, no one eats this flesh unless he first adores. Not only do we not sin by adoring, but we sin by not adoring.⁵²

Augustine speaks of a eucharistic body which is not identical with Christ's historical body. It is not the sensible flesh which is received, but rather the essence of it, the spirit. The point he makes is that the body of Christ is not eaten physically and materially, but sacramentally. Augustine refers to the Eucharist both as the physical object of perception and the spiritual object of faith which feeds the soul. Such language however is fully consistent with his recognition of the real presence.

Carolingian Era

Eucharistic doctrine remained as Augustine and Ambrose left it until the ninth century. No scholar arose to synthesize the teaching of these two great minds. At the time of the Carolingian renaissance, questions arose concerning not the fact of the real presence, but the identity of the eucharistic body. A confession of faith, attributed to Alcuin, posed the problem: All eat of it, but all eat the whole. It is divided in parts, but whole in the part. Eaten by all the people, it re-

⁵¹PL 37, 1265: "Spiritualiter intelligite quod locutus sum: non hoc corpus quod videtis, manducaturi estis, et bibituri illum sanguinem, quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi; spiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos. Etsi necesse sit illud visibiliter celebrari, oportet taen invisibiliter intelligi."

⁵²PL 37, 1264: "Et quia in ipsa carne hic ambulavit, et ipsa carnem nobis manducandam ad salutem dedit; nemo autem illam carnem manducat, nisi prius adoraverit; inventum est quemadmodum adoretus tale scabellum pedum Domini, et non solum non peccemus adorando, sed peccemus non adorando."

mains whole and entire. Whole in heaven, whole in the hearts of the faithful.⁵³ The fact that the body of Christ is entirely in heaven and entirely in each consecrated host was accepted on faith; but what could be said of this eucharistic body of Christ? What is the relation between the eucharistic body and the historical body? Is the eucharistic body the same as the heavenly body?

It was in this context that the first treatise on the subject of the Eucharist was written.⁵⁴ Paschasius Radbertus therein asserted the identity of the eucharistic body and the historical body of Christ, at the same time saying that the eucharistic body is not present in the same way as the historical body; it is spiritually present; all must be understood spiritually by the mind which cannot feel anything corporally. What we eat is wholly spiritual.⁵⁵ The Eucharist is simultaneously reality (veritas), since it really contains the body and blood of Christ, and

⁵³PL 101, 1088: "Omnes manducant ex eo, sed unusquisque totum manducat. Dividitur per partes, sed totus in partibus. Manducatus ab omni populo, sanus et integer manet. Totus in caelo, totus in cordibus fidelium." For the development of the doctrine in the early middle ages, see F. Vernet, "Eucharistie du IX^e à la fin du XI^e siècle," DTC, 5-2, 1209-32.

⁵⁴The De corpore et sanguine Domini of Paschasius Radbertus, a Benedictine monk and abbot of Corbie. Written in 831, the treatise was not published until 844 when it was sent to Charles the Bald. It is found in PL 120, 1259-1350. An English translation of excerpts is available in Volume 9 of the Library of Christian Classics, Philadelphia, 1957.

⁵⁵PL 120, 1305-1306: "Quatenus totum spiritaliter intelligere mens satageret ubi nihil carnale sentire licet. . . . Totum spiritale est quod comedimus." "Spiritual" is not used in a spirit-matter opposition. It has to do with the manner of knowing a reality. If a reality can be sensibly perceived, it is known through the senses; if it is not sensibly perceptible as such, it is known spiritually, i.e. by the intellectual faculties.

figure (figura), since it recalls the immolation of the cross. For Paschasius, figure (figura) represented what could be externally sensed; reality (veritas) referred to what was interiorly known and believed. He disagreed with those who said that the reality of the flesh and blood of Christ is not in the thing signified; that in the sacrament there is the virtue of the flesh, not flesh; the virtue of the blood, not blood; figure, not reality; shadow, not body. For Paschasius, the reality (veritas) is the body of Christ; the figure (figura) is the visible host.⁵⁶

The other great work of the ninth century was the eucharistic treatise of Ratramnus, written at the request of Charles the Bald.⁵⁷ Two questions were to be answered: do the eyes see without figure or veil all that is in the Eucharist? and, is the eucharistic body the same body which was born, suffered and died, and now sits at the right hand of the Father? There was no thought of affirming or denying the real

⁵⁶PL 120, 1357B: "Unde miror quid velint nunc quidam dicere, non in re esse veritatem carnis Christi vel sanguinis, sed in sacramento virtutem quamdam carnis, et non carnem; virtutem fore sanguinis, et non sanguinem; figuram, et non veritatem; umbram, et non corpus; cum hic species accipit veritatem, et figura veterum hostiarum, corpus." These texts indicate the importance of understanding the terminology used. Veritas is one of the key words in eucharistic doctrine, yet scholars seem to use it in almost contradictory ways. By veritas, Paschasius means the total reality as it is in itself, which is the body of Christ at the right hand of the Father. The figura is what is sensibly perceived, i.e. the eucharistic bread. Berengarius will make the same distinction but phrase it differently. Cf. the discussion in Chapter IV.

⁵⁷The De corpore et sanguine Domini of Ratramnus, a Benedictine monk of Corbie. The treatise was written about 844 at the request of Charles the Bald. The best edition is that of N. Bakhuizen van den Brink in the Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, AFD. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 61, No. 1, Amsterdam, 1954. An English translation can be found in Volume 9 of the Library of Christian Classics, Philadelphia, 1957. Cited hereafter as DCSD.

presence, but of discovering if the Eucharist, being reality, is still figure. Ratramnus seems not to identify the eucharistic body and the historical body, since one is visible and palpable, while the other is invisible, impalpable and spiritual.⁵⁸ Actually, this does not differ much from Paschasius' idea of the same body in different modes of being. Paschasius approaches the question from the reality present and sees it as the same in the heavenly body and in the Eucharist. Ratramnus is thinking in terms of the external expression of the reality and sees this as different. Actually both hold for a single reality present in different ways. Yet, both Ratramnus and Paschasius had their followers in the succeeding centuries.

Eleventh Century

In the eleventh century, controversy centered directly on the question of the real presence and led to the first actual examination of the dogma. Berengarius was the center of the dispute. Although he has always been accused of denying the fact of transubstantiation, his position concerning the real presence is still disputed.⁵⁹ Many of his

⁵⁸DCSD, 88; van den Brink, p. 56: "Quapropter corpus et sanguis quod in ecclesia geritur differt ab illo corpore et sanguine quod in Christi corpore per resurrectionem jam glorificatum cognoscitur. Et hoc corpus pignus est et species, illud vero ipsa veritas." DCSD, 89; van den Brink, p. 56: "Videmus itaque multa differentia separari misterium sanguinis et corporis Christi quod nunc a fidelibus sumitur in ecclesia et illud quod natum est de Maria virgine quod passum quod sepultum quod resurrexit quod caelos ascendit quod ad dexteram patris sedet."

⁵⁹"Un estudio general de los autores que escribieron sobre la Eucaristia contra Berengario, da enseguida la sensacion de que se trataba ciertamente de algo mas que de la conversion substancial, la lucha versaba ciertamente tambien sobre la negacion de la Presencia Real." L. Ramirez, La controversia eucaristica del s. XI. Berengario de Tours a la luz de sus contemporaneos, Bogota, 1940, p. 6. A brief exposition of Berengarius' position is given by M. Cappuyns, DEGE, 8, 403-405. Cf. J. Geiselman, Die Eucharistielehre, p. 359.

contemporaries opposed his eucharistic views. Lanfranc of Bec intended to answer the refutation Berengarius made of the oath imposed upon him by the Council of Rome in 1059. The purpose of his treatise (which is described more fully in Chapter III) was to refute the sacrilegious statements of this heretic, who dared to oppose the bishops and the faith of the whole Church.⁶⁰ Earlier, in 1058, Durandus of Troarn had come to the defense of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist.⁶¹ One of the most vehement opponents of Berengarian thought was Guitmund of Aversa who upheld the substantial change of the bread and wine.⁶² In the course of the controversy, Paschasius emerged as the model of orthodoxy, quoted by the defenders of the faith and much scorned by Berengarius. Ratramnus was to be linked with the thought of Berengarius.⁶³ Paradoxically, this thought

⁶⁰PL 150, 409C: "Hujus propositi sacrilegus violator contra prae-fatam synodum, contra catholicam veritatem, contra omnium Ecclesiarum opinionem scriptum postea condidisti, cui in hoc opusculo, confisus de Christi misericordia, respondere disposui." Lanfranc's treatise, De corpore et sanguine Domini, since it is the immediate provocation of Berengarius' main work, will be examined in Chapter III of this study. Cf. E. Amann and A. Gaudel, "Lanfranc," DTC, 8-1, 2558-2570; also A. J. Macdonald, Lanfranc, London, 1944.

⁶¹Liber de corpore et sanguine Christi, PL 149, 1375-1424. It is interesting to note that Berengarius' strongest adversaries were the monks. It could be a reflection not only of the rivalry between the monastic and cathedral schools, but of their different approach. "On s'explique que les moines accusent Bérenger d'incompétence théologique, qu'ils le traitent de pur dialecticien, et l'on conçoit que Bérenger, citant Horace et Terence, traite de haut et d'un ton dédaigneux des adversaires qui n'ont jamais, à l'entendre, lu d'autres auteurs que quelques Pères de l'Eglise." R. Heurtevent, Durand de Troarn et les origines de l'hérésie bérengarienne, Paris, 1913, p. 32.

⁶²De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate in eucharistia, PL 149, 1427-1494. Cf. P. Schaughnessy, The Eucharistic Doctrine of Guitmund of Aversa, Rome, 1938.

⁶³The defenders of orthodoxy were concerned with the reality present, accusing Berengarius of saying the bread is only a sign. Paschasius had a similar approach. On the other hand, Berengarius was opposing, as Ratramnus had done, an over-realistic bodily presence.

which had been orthodox two centuries earlier was looked upon in this century as an innovation.⁶⁴

Again, the controversy sought to explain how the body of Christ can be totally in heaven and still totally in the consecrated host. It was in the process of working out this problem that eucharistic doctrine became clarified and terminology reached a point of precision which enabled the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 to formulate its definition.⁶⁵ The eleventh and twelfth centuries saw much discussion on the meaning, the significance, and the reality of a sacrament; on the relation between the sacrament and the reality it signifies; and on the process by which the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ. As more of Aristotle's works became known, the metaphysical problems of presence and change were recognized as such and not handled according to the principles of logic. Perhaps more pertinently, these problems were investigated in the light of Aristotelian rather than Platonic metaphysics. Vocabulary was refined; in particular, the idea of substance and of substantial change was clarified. The richness of patristic thought was examined, codified, harmonized,

⁶⁴"Le fait n'en est pas moins là: tandis que sous Charles le Chauve c'était plutôt Paschase Radbert qui avait paru innover à beaucoup, maintenant Bérenger scandalisait toute l'Eglise. . . . Or, si la situation s'était ainsi renversée, la cause n'en est pas à chercher d'un seul côté. Il est certain que l'angle de vision s'était lentement déplacé, depuis deux siècles, au sein de l'orthodoxie; mais il paraît non moins certain que celui de Bérenger, quoi qu'il en pensât, ne coïncidait plus tout à fait non plus avec celui de Ratramne, moins encore avec celui des anciens Pères." H. de Lubac, Corpus mysticum, Paris, 1949, p. 165.

⁶⁵The reason for the state of doubt and confusion was basically the lack of a metaphysical system concerning the nature of a physical body, accidents, multilocation, and substantial presence. Bonano, p. 4. The controversy added "important contributions to a clearer understanding of the nature of the Eucharistic conversion, the permanence of the species, and the relations between the sacramentum tantum, the res sacramenti, and the res-et-sacramentum." Sheedy, The eucharistic controversy, p. x.

and renewed. Out of all this intellectual activity emerged Lateran's truly great conciliar profession of faith. Nothing comparable had been proclaimed since Nicea; nor would a statement of equal worth be made until Trent.⁶⁶

Conclusions

Even in so simplified a view of the history of the doctrine of the real presence, it becomes evident that the concept of body is vital to the meaning of presence.⁶⁷ To say that the bread is the body of Christ is to say that Christ is truly present. He is present as man, as the man who lived, suffered, died, and rose for all men. He is present as man, in the humanness which makes him approachable and attainable to men. He is present as man in the fullness of risen life which makes possible a union with Christians which can be realized in no other way.

Yet when Christians began to apply reason to their eucharistic faith, it became increasingly clear that the body of Christ is not known in the ordinary bodily way. The mutual actions which constitute the presence of one body to another: contact, attraction, resistance, are simply not there. A strong faith can accept a statement of fact that the power of God makes Christ present. But an inquiring mind will investigate how this presence is actually maintained.

⁶⁶"Et, en attendant la définition du IV^e concile oecuménique de Lateran, qui contiendra le mot 'transsubstantiation', le concile non oecuménique de Lateran de 1079 exige de Bérenger une profession de foi qui renferme la doctrine de la transsubstantiation." J. de Ghellinck, "Eucharistie au XII^e siècle en Occident," DTC, 5-2, 1224.

⁶⁷Cf. the excellent article of F. de Lanversin, "Le concept de présence et quelques-unes de ses applications," Recherches de Science Religieuse 23 (1933), 58-80.

Such was the problem which faced the inquiring minds of the eleventh century. All agreed to the fact that the species of bread and wine become by consecration the body and blood of Christ. But they were faced with the awesome task of investigating, with the limited tools of intellectual research available to them, both the manner and the origin of this presence. It is due to their initiative that we have the dogmas of faith which guide us in further endeavors to understand the mystery of presence.

The doctrine of the eucharistic presence has been firmly believed and taught from the beginning of the Church. Both the early liturgy and the writings of the Fathers give ample testimony to the fact. But the meaning of the doctrine and the way it was expressed did not come into question until men began to apply methods of reasoning to the mysteries of faith.

An attempt to explain the presence of a person involves metaphysical and epistemological principles. At the time when rational investigation of the faith was evolving, philosophical thought was strongly Platonic.⁶⁸ Plato himself never solved the problem of the relationship between material things and ideal reality. He and his followers accepted without adequate explanation the existence of material objects which in some way participated in and resembled an unseen reality. It is, then, not surprising to find medieval theologians expressing the relationship of things to reality in terms of participation and likeness.

Terms which express participation or similitude had always been used by the Fathers, not always with the same understanding. The question

⁶⁸R. Arnou, "Platonisme des Pères," DTC, 12-2, 2258-2392.

arose in Carolingian times as to what meaning the terms might have. Ratramnus was careful to set out at the beginning of his treatise his precise use of the terms veritas and figura. By the eleventh century logical methods had forced men to define the exact meaning of the terminology they used and to defend by reasonable arguments the statements they made.

It seems feasible to begin a study of eucharistic presence with the precise problem of the relation of body to presence, and at the point where the problem arose, the eleventh-century controversy. Undoubtedly at the center of dispute was the belief of Berengarius of Tours. His thought was expressed primarily in lectures to students, of which no record remains, although some pertinent letters remain for scholarly perusal.⁶⁹ The one treatise from which his eucharistic doctrine can be culled is a polemical reply to Lanfranc's attack on his position.⁷⁰ It is in an

⁶⁹His personal letters, aside from those he wrote in the name of certain of his protectors, number twenty-three. Cappuyns lists and comments on each of them. DHGE, 397-400. They are important for an insight into Berengarius' early thought; especially the letters to: Lanfranc (1049), PL 150, 63; Ascelinum (1050), PL 150, 66; Adelmannum (ca. 1052), E. Martene and U. Durand, Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum, Paris, 1717, t. 4, pp. 109-113.

⁷⁰The De Sacra Coena is extant in a single manuscript found in 1770 by G. E. Lessing, entitled Berengarius Turonensis oder Ankundigungeines wichtigen Werkes desselben (Wolfenbittel n. 4185). It is damaged at the beginning and at the end. No complete publication of the text appeared until that of 1834 by A. F. and F. T. Vischer, Berengarii Turonensis de sacra coena adversus Lanfrancum liber posterior e codice Guelferbytano.

A new edition has been done by W. H. Beekenkamp, Berengarii Turonensis De Sacra Coena Adversus Lanfrancum, Kerkhistorische Studien, Deel 2, Hague, 1941. It is accompanied by a commentary, De Avondmaalsleer van Berengarius van Tours, Kerkhistorische Studien, Deel 1, Hague, 1941. The text is a vast improvement over that of Vischer, although it is not by any means technically perfect. The arrangement, numbering, and above all the identification of quotations are especially appreciated. The commentary is adequate, discussing the life and works of Berengarius, the content of the De Sacra Coena, the manuscripts and editions, the question of John Scotus and Ratramnus, and the history of the doctrine

analysis of this work, the De Sacra Coena, that this study attempts to discern Berengarius' idea of the real presence in the Eucharist, and the extent to which his notion of body influenced his idea of presence.

The procedure of the study will be first of all to note the intellectual and political milieu which nourished the thought of Berengarius; secondly, to examine briefly the challenge of Lanfranc, both as to method and as to doctrine, as it is expressed in his De corpore et sanguine Domini. The main section of the study will analyze the text of De Sacra Coena in an attempt to elucidate Berengarius' idea of real presence as it is influenced by his concept of sacrament and of body. From this information, it will then be possible to draw some conclusions concerning the extent to which the notion of body influenced the idea of real presence.

up to and since Berengarius. It is largely a recapitulation of previous works and avoids the work done in the 1930's, such as Cappuyn's article in DHGE, and the reports on newly discovered works of Berengarius. Cf. the review by J. de Ghellinck in Nouvelle Revue Théologique 68 (1946), p. 359.

The exact date when Berengarius wrote the De Sacra Coena is not known. "Onze slotsom is deze; voorlopig zullen wij het jaar, waarin 'De sacra coena' het licht zag, alleen bij benadering kunnen opgeven. Het zal tussen 1063 en 1069 geweest zijn." Beekenkamp, 1, p. 11.

CHAPTER II

INFLUENCES IN THE FORMATION OF BERENGARIUS' THOUGHT

Intellectual Milieu

Berengarius of Tours was born into a century of turmoil which would erupt into the intellectual synthesis of the scholastic era.¹

He was a man of independent spirit and temperament,² educated in the traditions of the past, yet straining towards the methods of the future.

¹Berengarius was born in the first years of the eleventh century at Tours. "De berekeningen van het geboortjaar variëren tussen 998 en 1018. . . Tours is naar alle waarschijnlijkheid zijn geboorteplaats geweest." Beekenkamp, I, p. 6. Cf. PL, 213, 978D; also, Cappuyns, DHGE, 385. Evidence for and against an approximate date of 1000, as well as details of family background are given by Macdonald, Berengar, pp. 3-6. "The great revival of the eleventh century, which gathered amplitude and momentum in the twelfth century, and reached its highest and most characteristic, though not perhaps its most universal, achievement in the thirteenth century, was manifest in all contemporary mental activities, and affected theology, philosophy, religious reform, both public and private, literature as well in poetry as in prose, architecture, sculpture, illumination, law both canon and civil, mathematics and the natural sciences." D. Knowles, The Evolution of Medieval Thought, New York, 1964, p. 79. A picture of the intellectual milieu can be gleaned from such excellent works as E. Gilson, The History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages, New York, 1955; F. Copleston, History of Philosophy, v. 2, pt. 1, New York, 1962; as well as from the more specialized studies of J. de Ghellinck, M. D. Chenu, and N. Haring.

²"His enemy, Guitmund, reported that he had heard from contemporaries of Berengar at Chartres that, puffed up by conceit of mind, he cared not for the teaching of his master, regarded his fellow-students as of no consequence, and made light of the books used for grammatical studies That these statements were spitefully made is clear, but they indicate that while a student at Chartres Berengar possessed sufficient independence of character and clearness of mind to be able to discuss the teaching of Fulbert, to maintain his own convictions against other scholars, and to criticize the textbooks in use." Macdonald, Berengar, p. 17.

A product of the famous school of Chartres under the master Fulbert,³ scholasticus at Tours,⁴ and archdeacon of Angers,⁵ Berengarius absorbed the currents of Augustinian-Platonic thought.⁶ He struggled to understand and explain his faith within this context, using the tools of an emerging Aristotelian method. Not particularly original in either approach or content,⁷ Berengarius was nevertheless challenged as an innovator and forced on several occasions to retract his statements before official synods of the Church.⁸ To understand his dilemma, it

³It is probable that Berengarius began his instruction at St. Martin at Tours, but was intellectually formed by his education at Chartres: "in academia Carnotensi sub nostro illo venerabili Socrate." PL 213, 979C; Cappuyns, DHGE, 386; Macdonald, Berengar, p. 7. Fulbert was a pupil of Gerbert at Rheims. He opened the school at Chartres in 990, became bishop of that city in 1007, and died in 1029. PL 141, 335; 141, 194, 202.

⁴Macdonald traces the evidence and places Berengar back at Tours by at least 1031. Berengar, p. 22. The school of Tours was in the Carolingian tradition, Alcuin himself having taught there and done much to increase its library and facilities.

⁵Cappuyns, DHGE, 388; Macdonald, Berengar, p. 36.

⁶As we shall see, Chartres was strongly Augustinian and Platonic. Tours also followed this tradition, being the source of such Augustinian-grounded scholars as Raban Maur and Haymo of Halberstadt. Macdonald, Berengar, p. 23; Cappuyns, DHGE, 386. It would seem that realism was well established at Tours: "Realism is already implied in the teaching of e.g. Fredegisius who succeeded Alcuin as Abbot of St. Martin's Abbey at Tours and maintained that every name or term supposes a corresponding positive reality." Copleston, p. 162.

⁷At least Ratrammus had said much the same thing in much the same way. But the eleventh-century reaction was swift and violent. "In applying the science of logic to theology he was merely continuing an established principle. But in building his theology on logic, in placing dialectics as the foundation and first principle of his theology, he inverted the order beyond all question, and thus separated himself from the pre-scholastic stream." Sheedy, p. 33. It remains to be seen in the analysis of the text whether such a judgment of Berengarius' method can be supported.

⁸Between 1050 and 1079 Berengarius was anathematized by thirteen councils--Rome (four), Tours (two), and one at Brionne, Vercelli, Paris, Florence, Rouen, Angers, and Poitiers. Macdonald, Lanfranc, p. 49, n. 6. Ramirez discusses each of the councils in the second chapter of his dissertation.

will be of interest to trace the factors which fed his intellectual development.

The Schools

The process of forming the minds of men in the eleventh century was still under the dominant influence of Augustine.⁹ This was particularly true of the school of Chartres where Augustinian thought and method were both esteemed. The plan for training scholars, laid down in the fifth-century treatise on Christian learning (De doctrina christiana), was still in effect in the eleventh-century scholastic system. According to Augustine, a man who sought to investigate the mysteries of the Bible needed a knowledge of all the sciences. The Christian curriculum should have a place for all knowledge, whether it be the nature of animals and plants, the symbolism of numbers, the movements of the heavens, or the harmonies of music. Then, in order to communicate this learning, a scholar needed training in the art of rhetoric.

From the time of Cassiodorus,¹⁰ secular studies had been recognized as having a value of their own aside from their contribution to biblical knowledge. But it was Boethius¹¹ who had given the impetus for a real

⁹Cf. R. W. Southern, The Making of the Middle Ages, New Haven, 1953; J. Leclercq, The Love of Learning and the Desire for God, New York, 1961; C. H. Haskins, The Renaissance of the 12th Century, New York, 1963.

¹⁰Cassiodorus (c. 477-565/70) was a pupil of Boethius. His book on the liberal arts was much used as a text book in the early Middle Ages. PL 70, 1149-1218.

¹¹Boethius (c. 480-525) translated Aristotle's Perihermeneias, with two commentaries, one for beginners and one for advanced students. He also translated Aristotle's Prior Analytics, Posterior Analytics, Sophistic Arguments, and Topics. But these translations remained unknown until the middle of the twelfth century, when they came to be known as the new logic, as opposed to the old logic. Gilson, History, p. 603.

development of thought which took place in the eleventh century. He aimed to present Greek learning to the Latin world by translating the works of Plato and Aristotle. Although he never completed the task, he is responsible for making available to the Latin students the main outline of Aristotle's system of logic. The logical works of Boethius were, however, largely neglected until the time of Gerbert¹² who seems to have been the first to lecture systematically on these logical treatises. The circulation of these works resulted in a more intensive study and a higher level of proficiency in the science of logic than had been known in the West. The difficulties of much of the eleventh-century thought can be attributed to the fact that there was not a comparable and accompanying advance in metaphysics. We shall see this quite clearly in the thought of Berengarius.¹³

Dialectics

From the time of Gerbert, logic assumed an importance it had never previously enjoyed in Western Christian thought. For Augustine, and later for Erigena, dialectic was necessary, it was important, but it was a method, not knowledge itself. With the organization of the teaching

¹²Gerbert, a monk of Aurillac, spent three years in Spain and thus became familiar with Arabic science. He was head of the school of Rheims, and eventually Pope Sylvester II (999-1003), the first French pope. His program for teaching logic was: a textual explanation of Porphyry's Isagoge; and explanation of the Categories of Aristotle, the Perihermeneias, the Topics, with Boethius' commentary. His letters give an insight into the intellectual life of his time. PL 139. Gilson, History, p. 614.

¹³"One of the major points of this study is that Berengar of Tours approached the Eucharist almost exclusively from the dialectical point of view; but it was not precisely as a dialectician that he went astray; the basic error was a false metaphysical principle." Sheedy, p. 12. It is much easier to agree with the last part of the statement than with the first.

of the liberal arts, logic became one of the trivium along with grammar and rhetoric. It came to designate, not only a process of thought, but knowledge itself in so far as it is the word of reasoning. In the age between the Carolingian renaissance and the eleventh-century intellectual revival, dialectics all but dropped out of the trivium. Education became mainly literary, based on grammar and rhetoric. It was only in the eleventh century that dialectics resumed its place at the peak of the curriculum.¹⁴ This revival of dialectics was perhaps the most remarkable feature of the mental awakening. It was at least partially due to the fact that dialectics is an instrument of order and, in the eleventh century, men were sorely in need of order. The world was chaotic wherever they turned; the world of nature, the world of politics, the intellectual realm. Dialectics gave men a glimpse of an orderly and systematic view of the world and of man's mind. Students were taught to classify objects and to classify the statements which can be made about an object in argument or discussion.

This process of simplification and arrangement was welcomed also in the field of dogma. The method of theological discussion underwent a

¹⁴"Finally we may note that in the Carolingian age dialectic was so little prized that it was transposed from its true place to a position between grammar and rhetoric, as something to be got over quickly. In the revival of the eleventh century it was restored to its rightful place, developed enormously, and then augmented by the whole Aristotelian corpus of philosophy and its accompanying commentaries. The change from rhetoric to logic as the pièce de resistance of the curriculum is the index of a cultural revolution." Knowles, p. 75. But de Ghellinck points to the high regard for dialectic in the Carolingian curriculum: "la théologie scolastique doit remonter, pour expliquer ses attaches avec la dialectique, jusqu'au programme, scolaire des institutions carolingiennes qui plaçait le dialectique, comme couronnement, au sommet du trivium." It was continually esteemed and given emphasis by scholars from the time of Augustine - PL 34; 57; Cassiodorus - PL 101, 951-976; Raban - De inst., III, 2. J. de Ghellinck, "Dialectique, théologie, et dogme au X^e - XII^e siècles," Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, Supp. Bd. 1, pp. 80-1.

profound change. The process of analysis was applied even to the strict mysteries. In fact, it was in theology that the change was most keenly felt. Although Erigena had advocated dialectics as the method to be used in achieving an understanding of what man believes, the controversies between dialecticians and anti-dialecticians did not arise until the eleventh century.¹⁵ Then all the writers concerned in the disputes knew and used dialectics. The argument which arose was not concerned with the method, but rather with its application to the faith. The question was whether it was fitting to submit the mysteries of faith to logical reasoning.¹⁶

¹⁵de Ghellinck cites some examples "pour montrer l'entrée lente de la dialectique dans l'étude de la dogmatique, pendant les cent cinquante années qui précèdent l'époque d'Abelard et de S. Anselme." "Dialectique," p. 84. "Le Vocabularium de Papias vers le milieu de XI^e siècle, . . . attestent à leur façon le succès de la dialectique par la large place qu'ils font au vocabulaire de la logique." Ibid., p. 85.

¹⁶"Au fond du tout, se rencontre une question tout autrement vitale: L'éternel problème de toute philosophie religieuse, celui des degrés de la certitude rationnelle et des rapports de la croyance et de la science, autrement dit de la foi et de la raison." de Ghellinck, "Dialectique," p. 92. "When in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries medieval men rediscovered logic, they became intoxicated with the wine of formal reasoning and the abstract beauty of its laws. Hence their natural tendency to deal in a purely logical way with all possible questions. They did this in philosophy and, as was to be expected, they did it also in theology. The only difference being that there was no philosopher of note to resist the intrusion of the logicians, whereas there were a great many theologians to check their encroachments on the field of theology. In point of fact, there is hardly a single one among the great logicians of that time who has not been accused of heresy, or even condemned for it. Berengar of Tours was condemned for his dialectical treatment of the Transubstantiation, Roscelin of Compiègne and Abailard for their dialectical interpretation of the mystery of the Trinity." E. Gilson, The Unity of Philosophical Experience, New York, 1937, p. 31. "The two spiritual groups whose ceaseless rivalry runs through the whole history of the Christian Middle Ages are already there, clearly discernible in the early history of the Islamic thought. Since, according to tradition, the Prophet had said: 'The first thing which God created was knowledge or Reason,' some Mohammedan theologians concluded that speculation was one of the duties of the believers; an argument that we shall find strictly paralleled by a similar statement in the writings of Berenger of Tours." Gilson, Unity, p. 34.

There were as yet no ground rules, but obviously each theologian considered the proper use of dialectics to be the one he himself made of it. The controversy between Berengarius and Lanfranc provides an excellent example of dialectical dispute.¹⁷

The eleventh century also witnessed a revival of interest in intellectual discourse. Widespread discussion and dispute were the outgrowth of an intellectual restlessness and a desire to know which are characteristic of this century and the ones which follow it. A comparison of the eucharistic controversies of the ninth and the eleventh centuries reveals a technical sharpness of logical distinction in the later scholars which was unknown to the Carolingian monks who leaned much more heavily on authority.¹⁸

¹⁷"Der ganze Berengarsche Abendmahlstreit fügt sich ganz gut in den Rahmen der dialektischen Strömungen des 11. Jahrhunderts ein." M. Grabmann, Geschichte der scholastischen Methode, Freiburg, 1957, I, p. 224. "A l'époque de Lanfranc, le dessarroi produit par cette invasion de la dialectique dans le domaine religieux commence à se manifester pleinement." de Ghellinck, "Dialectique," p. 86.

"Berengar exaggerated the importance of rational speculation, tried to use it to establish the content of the mystery of the Holy Eucharist, and thus disqualified himself from any appreciation of the truth of the Mystery of Faith." Sheedy, p. x.

"Man wird den Schlüssel zum Verständnis der berengarschen und antiberengarschen Eucharistielehre nicht so fast in einem bestimmten erkenntnistheoretischen Prinzip finden dürfen, etwa dem Nominalismus der berengarschen Theologie und dem Antinomialismus ihrer Gegner. . . . als vielmehr in einem formalen Prinzip, der Dialektik." Geiselman, Die Eucharistielehre, p. 290, n. 1.

¹⁸Lanfranc and Berengarius were both used to the lecture room and to debate. They each wrote in the form of detailed commentaries on the work of the other. This contrasts with the treatises of the ninth century which were written in the retirement of study. Moreover, dialectic had imposed a profound modification on the thought of the eleventh century in regard to the idea of substance. Behind the world of appearances there were henceforth two worlds: the world of spiritual significances and the world of substance, genera, and species. The controversy between Lanfranc and Berengar was the first big-scale theological dispute to be fought out under the dominance of this idea. R. W. Southern, "Lanfranc of Bec and Berengar of Tours," in Studies in Medieval History presented to F. M. Powicke, Oxford, 1948, p. 34, 38.

Chartres

The desire for learning drew men far from their homes. Gerbert came to Rheims from Rome; Lanfranc from Pavia to Bec.¹⁹ Teaching had become a profession, and the cathedrals renewed their roles as centers of learning. The most vigorous of these cathedral schools was that at Chartres, founded and endowed with a distinctive tradition by Fulbert.²⁰

In the school of Chartres, there were two general branches of study: the profane and the sacred. There the scholar became proficient in the seven liberal arts and a specialty at Chartres: the study of medicine. In addition to the texts, classical authors were read, studied, and used as models. Greek was not commonly known, although Gerbert had initiated a renewed enthusiasm for the Greek authors. Fulbert, a pupil of Gerbert, had undoubtedly brought some of this interest to Chartres. The masters were capable of at least elementary New Testament exegesis. The Latin writers, both pagan and Christian, were much more available and thus more familiar to the students at Chartres. The prose, poetry, and oratory of Chartres were largely influenced by the great men of classical Rome.

The spiritualist and idealist tendencies of Plato were strong in the tradition of Chartres. There was a high regard for Plato, and a decided

¹⁹"It was in every sense of the word a supra-national movement, forming a republic of teachers, thinkers and writers For three hundred years, from 1050 to 1350, and above all in the century from 1070 to 1170, the whole of educated Western Europe formed a single undifferentiated cultural unit." Knowles, p. 80. "Les disciples en quête de savoir, voyagent d'une école à une autre et contribuent des lors à 'internationaliser' la science." de Ghellinck, "Dialectique," p. 82.

²⁰The authoritative work on the school of Chartres is still that of A. Clerval, Les écoles de Chartres au Moyen Age, Paris, 1895.

sympathy for Pseudo-Dionysius and Erigena.²¹ At the same time, the influence of Aristotle was coming to the fore. Aristotle, as expressed by Boethius, was the foundation of a subtle dialectic.²² Thus Chartres could be characterized as Aristotelian in method and Platonic in ideas.²³ The intellectual conflicts which were inevitable gave rise to two great disputes: in the area of eucharistic doctrine, the relation of sign to reality; in the philosophical question of universals, the relation of thought to reality.

For the most part, the scholars of Chartres pursued a literal and historical interpretation of Scripture.²⁴ They relied heavily on the authority of Scripture and were quite familiar with the Latin Fathers,

²¹"Il n'est pas sûr qu'on eut entré les mains le *Timée* de Platon traduit par Chalcidius, amis Fulbert déclarait Platon, superieur à tous les autres penseurs de l'antiquité, et Bérenger l'appelait la perle de la philosophie. On avait des sympathies pour les Néoplatoniciens, tels que Denys l'Aréopagite, Scot Erigène et Boèce dans sa Consolation de la Philosophie." Clerval, pp. 117-8.

²²Fulbert even composed a verse on the differences between rhetoric and dialectic. "On y lisait que la rhétorique a pour objet le fait concret, et la dialectique la thèse et la vérité abstraite, que l'une parle avec aisance et préfère l'enthymème, tandis que l'autre se sert du syllogisme, enfin, que la première se propose de persuader et l'autre de convaincre par l'évidence." Clerval, p. 115. "Sixteen different treatises in dialectics were in use at Chartres. Yet, 'Aristote, traduit ou résumé par Boèce, faisait toujours le fond du cours de Dialectique.'" *Ibid.*, p. 117.

²³"Plus ou moins consciemment, les chartrains se partageaient en deux camps, selon leurs lectures et leurs habitudes d'esprit: les uns, et c'était le plus grand nombre, se laissaient aller aux tendances spiritualistes et idéalistes de Platon; d'autres s'attachaient davantage aux procédés critiques et sensualistes d'Aristote." Clerval, p. 118. MacDonald thinks this description too sharply outlined; he admits the appearance of a divergence of thought but maintains that writers of that period could not yet be classified into schools or methods. *Berengar*, p. 12.

²⁴Fulbert abandoned the allegorical approach for the literal and historical interpretation. Clerval, p. 130. A reflection of this is seen in Berengarius when he often tried to force Lanfranc to a literal understanding of a disputed passage in Scripture.

particularly Jerome, Gregory, Ambrose, Hilary, Cyprian, and Augustine.²⁵

Theology remained much more positive than scholastic. Reason was rarely used for more than exposition of the truths of faith.

Berengarius, Scholasticus of Tours

In this milieu, Berengarius emerged as somewhat of an innovator. He was distinguished as a grammarian, interested in the relations between language and reality, and anxious to apply his learning to the clarification of dogma. As a matter of fact, Berengarius distinguished himself in many fields, being known as a poet,²⁶ as a teacher,²⁷ and orator;²⁸ he was learned in medicine²⁹ and a skilled dialectician.³⁰ There does not seem to be much truth to the charge that he was a revolutionary at

²⁵"Ces auteurs . . . étaient ses oracles, soit dans l'intelligence du texte sacré, soit dans le développement des doctrines théologiques." Clerval, p. 131.

²⁶In Berengarius' epitaph, Hildebert of Tours described him as the leading poet of the age. PL 171, 139f. A sample of his Latin poetry is the "Juste, Judex Jesu" written while awaiting the proposed ordeal of fire at the Council of Rome in 1079. Martène, IV, 115f; and English translation in Macdonald, Berengar, p. 187f.

²⁷"Berengarius Turonensis, liberalium artium et amplius dialecticae perita insignis." PL 160, 582.

²⁸Even Guitmund, his enemy, paid tribute to the effect of Berengarius' eloquence upon his students: "et vix tandem satis desideratae diu vocis lentissimo quodam quasi plangore incautos decipiens." PL 149, 1428B.

²⁹"Ad hoc quis non miretur tuam in arte medendi, qua ipsis, qui se medicos profitentur, premines, excellentiam?" Drogo zu Paris an Berengar, H. Sudendorf, Berengarius Turonensis oder eine Sammlung Ihn betreffender Briefe, Hamburg, 1850, p. 200.

³⁰Hugh speaks of him as "virorum acutissime." PL 142, 1326D.

Chartres, nor that Fulbert was moved to disown him.³¹ The fact that his career as a teacher was so rapidly successful is evidence of his reputation on leaving Chartres.

In charge of the school of Tours, Berengarius proved himself a brilliant teacher of the liberal arts, especially renowned in grammar, rhetoric, and logic.³² He revived interest in etymologies and evidently went so far as to correct the pronunciation of Latin.³³ Berengarius was adept at exegesis but showed his independent spirit in theology as

³¹Cappuyns relegates it to legend: "Les prétendues inquietudes de Fulbert au sujet de l'orthodoxie de son disciple sont à rejeter dans le domaine de la légende: tel le récit de Guillaume de Malmesbury (PL, t. CLXXIX, col. 1258), décrivant Fulbert mourant (10 avril 1028) et ordonnant à Berenger de sortir de la chambre; tel aussi le propos d'Ascelin reconnaissant une allusion à Berenger dans l'inscription qui ornait le calice du vieux maître (Epist. Bereng. ad Richardum, ed. Sudendorf, p. 212). Quant aux révélations de Guitmond d'Aversa sur l'attitude orgueilleuse et hautaine du jeune étudiant -- elatus ingenii levitate ipsius magistri sensum non adeo curabat, condiscipulorum pro nihilo reputabat, libros insuper artium contemnebat, etc. (PL, t. CXLIX, col. 1428A) -- elles viennent d'un adversaire passionné, qui se dit renseigné par des tiers et juge du passé par de qu'il sait du présent." DHGE, 386.

³²Cappuyns, DHGE, 386. For a discussion of dates, see Macdonald, Berengar, pp. 22, 27, 28. Berengar was rector of the school by 1040. Under his influence Tours became one of the great centers of classical learning in Europe. His use of classical authors is attested by his works.

³³He was not afraid to adapt traditional texts to his own methods, and was therefore charged with introducing novelties: "novis saltem verborum interpretationibus quibus etiam nunc nimirum gaudet." PL 149, 1428A. "Juvenes quosdam qui ad nos descenderant, in claustris suis a praelatis eorum regulariter pulsatos esse, eo quod in lectionibus ecclesiasticis accentus tuos insolenter usurperunt auresque fratrum aliter imbutas, inusitatis quorundam verborum prolatione offenderent." Adelmann, Epist., Heurtevent, p. 302.

elsewhere.³⁴ He was accused of lack of respect for tradition.³⁵ But, as a Christian and a teacher, his morality was never called in question; his austere life evidently commanded the respect and esteem of others.³⁶

Yet, Berengarius was intellectually and theologically challenged quite early in his career. Hugh of Langres was the first to reproach Berengarius for what seemed to him quite novel ideas concerning the Eucharist. He questioned Berengarius as to the possibility of a body which is incorporeal. Hugh had heard that Berengarius said the bread and wine were not changed essentially; that the body of Christ exists

³⁴Macdonald says that his students were taught to seek out rather the literal and rational than the allegorical meaning of Scripture, but not at the expense of the inward meaning of the text. They acquired Berengarius' independent method of interpretation. He goes on to claim that Berengarius "expounded the Psalms, the Epistles of St. Paul, and the Apocalypse in a new way, and his teaching was regarded as an innovation." Berengar, p. 31. Cappuyns rejects the claim to extensive biblical works done by Berengarius: "Nous n'irions pas cependant jusqu'à préciser avec plusieurs auteurs qu'il commenta les psaumes, saint Paul et l'Apocalypse, le texte de Gozechin auquel il est ici fait illusion (PL, 6. CXLIII, col. 900B) ne s'appliquent directement qu'aux disciples de Berenger." DHGE, 387.

³⁵Epist. Bereng. ad Ansfrid, Sudendorf, p. 209. Cappuyns claims that "Le moins qu'on puisse dire est que dans ses écrits Berenger fait la part plus large aux auteurs profanes qu'aux auteurs, . . . et que la methode qu'il preconise est nettement à base de raisonnement." While it is true that Berengarius refers to Horace, Terence, Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, Cicero, Catilinus, Laelius, Cethegus, Brutus, Cato, and Seneca (cf. Macdonald, Berengar, pp. 28-29 for textual references), neither the number of citations nor the influence on his thought or method can be compared to the overwhelming presence of Augustine and of Ambrose. "Het zijn 30 plaatsen uit het Oude en 97 uit het Nieuwe Testament; 90 uit Augustinus uit de volgende 22 geschriften: . . . 84 uit Ambrosius uit de volgende 7 geschriften: . . . 17 uit Lanfrancus . . . 9 uit Gregorius . . . 6 uit Horatius . . . en nog enige anderen." Beekenkamp, I, p. 16. As to the method, it is hoped that this study shows that Berengarius was attempting to apply the tool of dialectics for a clearer understanding of faith; the basis would be faith.

³⁶Even in the years of debate, no word of scandal was raised against the character of Berengarius. "Berengar was a very considerable figure, with a reputation as a person and as a teacher which was not seriously shaken by his condemnation." Knowles, p. 96.

intellectually. For Hugh, this would mean an incorporeal body, a teaching which he saw as a scandal to the Church and an offense to tradition.³⁷ However, Hugh did not consider Berengarius heretical but endeavored to show him the fallacy of certain viewpoints.³⁸

Adelmann, too, pleaded with his friend to respect the catholic peace, and accept the doctrine as he laid it before him: the body exists under the sacramental species in order that faith might be exercised in believing what is not seen.³⁹ Berengarius replied at this early stage of discussion in the same way he would continue to reply throughout: the body of Christ, true and human, is present in the Eucharist, not sensualiter, but intellectualiter. It is only to the intellect enlightened by faith that the body of Christ is known. The conversion which takes place at the words of consecration is not physical nor perceptible to the senses, but spiritual and known by the intellect.⁴⁰

³⁷PL 142, 1327: "Dicis enim, nimis extense loquens, in hujusmodi sacramento, corpus Christi sic esse ut panis et vini natura et essentia non mutetur; corpusque, quod dixeras crucifixum, intellectuale constituis. In quo evidentissime patet quod incorporeum confiteris. Qua in re, universalem Ecclesiam scandalizas, ipsumque tuum offendis auctorem, qui palpabile obtulit quod incorporeum affirmas. Namque si panis et vini natura et essentia reali principalitate, post consecrationem, persistunt, translatum nihil potest intelligi, et si quod adjunctum est sola fit intellectus potentia, revera non capitur quomodo, vel unde, vel idem sit quod adhuc non subsistit."

³⁸PL 142, 1327: "Porro autem, si ex sua essentia vel natura non habent salutis potentiam, habent ejus contrarium, sicque, dum in sua natura permanserit, erit impotens sacramentum contra rationem loqueris."

³⁹Sudendorf, 294: "ut ergo fides exerceatur credendo quod non apparet, vitale sacramentum sub specie corporea viriliter latet uti anima in corpore." 296: "non innatum, sed ex gratia Dei collatum, hoc vera esse fidem christianum."

⁴⁰Epist. ad Adelmann, Heurtevent, 287-303: "ac per hoc non concedere nullus possum post consecrationem ipsum panem et vinum facta esse fidei et intellectui verum Christi corpus et sanguinem." "panem et vinum mensae dominicae, non sensualiter, sed spiritaliter in totum converti Christi corpus et sanguinem." This is a statement of the main points of Berengarius' doctrine: the fact that the body of Christ is really present but that this

It was only when Berengarius, probably in the spirit of academic dispute, offered to discuss the Eucharist with Lanfranc, of the school of Bec, that the public controversy was initiated:

There comes to me, brother Lanfranc, a certain report from Ingelran of Chartres on which I have no right to hesitate from admonishing your love. It has displeased you, yea you regard as heresy the opinion of John the Scot on the sacrament of the altar, in which he disagrees with your accepted Paschasius. If this is so, brother, you have acted unworthily of the intellect which God gave you in no mean degree, by expressing an opinion over-hastily. For not yet have you busied yourself to such an extent in holy Scripture with your more diligent friends. Now, therefore, brother, however unlearned in that Scripture I may be, I would like only to hear about it, if opportunity occurred to me, in the presence of those you would wish, either as suitable arbiters or as listeners. So long as this is not done you should not look with scorn on what I say. If you regard John as a heretic, whose opinions on the Eucharist I approve, you ought to hold as heretics Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, not to mention the others.⁴¹

This is the letter which was read at the council of Rome in 1050, resulting in the first condemnation of Berengarius. From then on, Berengarius endured a succession of condemnations, professions of faith, swearing of oaths, and consequent retraction of every compromise. From the first condemnation by Leo IX in 1050 until the final reconciliation under

presence is not known in the ordinary sensible manner of perceiving a body. The kind of conversion involved in the consecration of the bread is a key factor in the reality of the bodily presence. These notions are developed in Chapters V, VI, and VII of this study.

⁴¹PL 150, 63C: "Pervenit ad me, frater Lanfranc, quiddam auditum ab Ingelranno Carnotensi, in quo dissimulare non debui admonere dilectionem tuam. Id autem est, displicere tibi, imo haereticas habuisse sententias Joannis Scotti de sacramento altaris, in quibus dissentit a suscepto tuo Paschasio. Hac ergo in re si ita est, frater, indignum fecisti ingenio, quod tibi Deus non esperabile contulit, praeproperam ferendo sententiam. Nondum enim adeo satigesti in Scriptura divina cum tuis diligentioribus. Et hunc ergo, frater, quantumlibet rudis in illa Scriptura vellem tantum audire, do eo si opportunum nihi fieret, adhibitis quibus velles, vel iudicibus congruis vel auditoribus. Quod quandiu non fit, non aspernanter aspicias quod dico. Si haereticum habes Joannem, cujus sententias de Eucharistia probemus, habendus tibi est haereticus Ambrosius, Hieronymus, Augustinus, ut de caeteris taceam." "Dit schrijven is het eerste begin geweest van een reeks verwikkelingen: de avondmaalsstrijd van de elfde eeuw." Beekenkamp, 1, p. 7.

Gregory VII in 1079, Berengarius' life was one great polemic confusion.⁴² Even in his last years before his death in 1088, his abiding regret was not for any possible deviation from the faith but for the perjury committed in pronouncing the oath of submission at Rome. There is no evidence of change of mind, but neither is there at any time valid evidence of a withdrawal from the Church.⁴³

Dominant Influences

Before pursuing the intricacies of the controversy, we should note what seem to be major influences in the development of Berengarius' doctrine. The Platonic strain as it is expressed in Augustine, Erigena, and Ratramnus seems to have played an important role in shaping Berengarius' theories of knowledge and of being.⁴⁴ A strong Platonic heritage could account for a ready acceptance of symbolism, of true reality as other than

⁴²Macdonald gives a full account: Berengar, pp. 59-197. Also, J. Hefele and H. Leclercq, Histoire des Conciles, t. 4, Paris, 1911: pp. 1040-1063; 1108; 1111; 1169; t. 5, Paris, 1921: pp. 136-138; 243-244; 249-250; 281.

⁴³"Celui-ci n'entend pas sortir de l'Eglise, ni être hérétique; il prétend que l'Eglise doit employer sa méthode, et, par elle, expliquer la théologie." Heurtevent, p. 34, n. 2.

⁴⁴It is typical of Augustine as of Plato and of Platonic thought that "being and knowability were proportioned to each other; if the intelligible world was to be the realm of truth, it was also the realm of being." J. F. Fahey, The Eucharistic Teaching of Ratramn of Corbie, Mundelein, Illinois, 1951, p. 147. "Where there is knowledge, there is being, and where there is being, there is knowledge. In other words, to be is to be thinkable, that is to say, to be is to be possessed of those attributes which are necessarily required in a possible object of thought." Gilson, Being and Some Philosophers, New York, 1952, p. 26. "Aristotle was the author of a massive system of logic, which was consistent with, and indeed geared to, his epistemology and metaphysics, but as a lower discipline it could be used without reference to the higher levels of philosophy. In the event, the later Platonists and Neoplatonists retained this logic while adopting a modified form of Platonic epistemology and metaphysics which were, as we have seen, adopted, with further modification, by Augustine." Knowles, p. 109.

the sensible, of material things as signs of this more ultimate reality. It would moreover subtly situate Berengarius as confronting the problem of truth rather than the problem of being in the way in which this was to be discussed by the men of the next century. In a world of truth, things are ordered in relation to the ultimate Truth. They are known by reason, but by a reason which is divinely illumined to see things as they are.

Augustine

Augustine, claimed as an authority by all involved in the eucharistic controversy, undoubtedly played a major role in the development of dogma in the Middle Ages.⁴⁵ It is then necessary to examine briefly Augustine's eucharistic teaching and its dominance in later theologizing.⁴⁶

For Augustine, a sacrament is a visible, tangible thing: the body and blood of Christ is received visibly in the sacrament, is eaten spiritually in reality.⁴⁷ In every sacrament there are two elements: a material and visible object, which signifies something, and an unseen and spiritual object which is signified. This is the distinction between the

⁴⁵Macdonald claims that "most Churchmen of Berengar's day followed the Ambrosian type of eucharistic doctrine." This is in keeping with his thesis that Berengarius kept alive the authentic Church doctrine passed on from the early Church through Augustine and still maintained by the reformers and, in particular, by the Anglican church. The claim is not documented.

⁴⁶For a complete treatment, see K. Adam, Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin, Paderborn, 1908; Geiselmann, Die Eucharistielehre, pp. 35-55. H. Lang has collected many of the eucharistic texts in Florilegium Patristicum 25, 1933.

⁴⁷Sermo 131; PL 38, 730: "Tunc autem hoc erit, id est, vita unicuique erit corpus et sanguis Christi, si quod in sacramento visibiliter sumitur, in ipsa veritate spiritualiter manducetur, spiritualiter bibatur."

sacramentum and the res.⁴⁸ The sacrament of the Eucharist is corporeal and has only a passing existence: what is seen passes on, but what is signified remains.⁴⁹ This corporeal sacrament signifies the reality of the body of Christ: it must be celebrated visibly, but understood invisibly.⁵⁰ It is not the reality but is related to the reality by the likeness it bears to it: a sacrament can only be called such if it resembles the reality of which it is a sign. Because of this relationship, the sacrament of the body of Christ is, in a certain sense, the body of Christ.⁵¹ For, this similarity makes it possible to call the sacrament by the name of the reality it signifies.⁵²

On the other hand, res, for Augustine, is spiritual and intelligible: the sacrament is celebrated visibly, while the reality is understood invisibly.⁵³ This reality which is present must be understood by the faithful if they are not to be guilty of a carnal eating: the people found

⁴⁸According to St. Augustine, we ought to distinguish between 1) a thing properly so called (res), which does not signify anything else; and 2) a sign or symbol (signum), i.e., a thing which, beyond the impression that it conveys to the senses, makes something else known. In the end, it is only God who is res, everything else is signum. Chydenius, pp. 8-9.

⁴⁹Sermo 227; PL 38, 1099: "Quod vides, transit; sed quod significatur invisibile, non transit; sed permanet."

⁵⁰Enarratio in Ps. 98, 9; PL 37, 1265: "Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi, spiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos. Etsi necesse est illud visibiliter celebrari, oportet tamen invisibiliter intelligi."

⁵¹Ep. 98, 9; PL 33, 364: "Si enim sacramenta quandem similitudinem earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnine sacramenta non essent Sicut ergo secundum quondam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi, sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei fides est."

⁵²Ep. 98, 9; PL 33, 364: "Sacramentum ergo tantae rei non nisi ejusdem rei vocabulo noncupavit."

⁵³Enarratio in Ps. 98, 9; PL 37, 1265: "Etsi necesse est illud visibiliter celebrari, oportet tamen invisibiliter intelligi."

the Lord's command difficult when he told them to eat his flesh if they would have eternal life. They understood this statement carnally, and could not accept it.⁵⁴ The body which Christ has given us is spiritual and invisible. Augustine explains that Christ meant what he said to be understood spiritually; they were not to eat the body which was seen at Capharnaum and on the cross.⁵⁵ The body of Christ suffers no change when the sacrament is consumed: what is seen changes; but what is invisibly signified remains. Augustine points out that in accepting and eating the sacrament, nothing of the body of Christ is consumed. Rather, what is signified remains eternally, although it visibly changes.⁵⁶ Augustine goes quite far in claiming the body of Christ to be an eternal reality signified by the Old Testament sacraments as well as by the Eucharist.⁵⁷

⁵⁴Ibid.: "Durum illis visum est quod sit, 'Nisi quis manducaverit carnem meam, non habebit vitam aeternam'; acceperunt illud stulti, carnaliter illud cogitaverunt, et putaverunt quod praecisurus esset Dominus particulas quasdam de corpore suo, et daturus illis, et dixerunt 'Durus est hic sermo'."

⁵⁵Ibid.: "Spiritualiter intellige quod locutus sum: non hoc corpus quod videtis, manducaturi estis; et bibituri illum sanguinem quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent."

⁵⁶Sermo 227; PL 38, 1099: "Quod vides, transit; sed quod significatur invisibile, non transit; sed permanet. Ecce accipitur, comeditur, consumitur: numquid corpus Christi consumitur? numquid ecclesia Christi consumitur? numquid membra Christi consumuntur? Absit. Hic mundantur, ibi coronantur. Manebit ergo quod significatur aeternaliter, quamquam transire videatur."

⁵⁷In Johannes Evangelium 26, 12; PL 35, 1612: "Hunc panem significavit manna, hunc panem significavit altare Dei. Sacramenta illa fuerunt: in signis diversa sunt; in re quae significatur, paria sunt . . . Aliud illi, aliud nos; sed specie visibili, quod tamen hoc idem significaret virtute spirituali." Sermo 352, 1, 3: "Breviter ergo dixerim: quicumque in manna Christum intellexerunt, eundem, quem nos cibum spiritualem manducaverunt."

The Platonic element in this theology is intriguing.⁵⁸ Augustine's eucharistic theology corresponds quite closely to Plato's view of reality. The sacrament of Augustine is in many ways similar to the phenomenon of Plato. For Plato, what we see and touch is not true reality, but the shadow of reality. The corporeal is subject to change; reality remains stable. The purpose of the sensible is to remind us of the real. Yet, sensible objects are not nothing, but in some sense participate in or resemble the Ideas. Because of this resemblance, they take their names from the realities they represent.

The concept of res as found in Augustine strongly resembles the Idea of Plato. It is the reality behind the object of our experience. It is spiritual, known only to the intellect. Reality is intelligible, not visible. Further the Ideas are eternal, not subject to change, addition, or diminution, regardless of the change in phenomenon. There is no denial of realism, but the assertion of a different kind of realism.⁵⁹

Augustine knew by faith that the Eucharist is really and truly the body of Christ. Yet, he seemed to distinguish between the historical and the eucharistic body. His Platonic background could account for this

⁵⁸The comparison of thought follows the study made by J. F. Fahey, The Eucharistic Teaching of Ratramn of Corbie, Mundelein, Illinois, 1951, pp. 130-162.

⁵⁹"If Augustine had ever made explicit his Platonic viewpoint he might have said that the reality of Christ's Body transcended the corporeal Body born of Mary, that the 'res' of the Eucharist is the reality itself; but since the corporeal Body does not actually inhere in the reality, there is cause to distinguish the content of the Eucharist from the Body born of Mary." Fahey, p. 157. For Augustine, "le symbole, sacramentum, mysterium, EST vraiment ce qu'il signifie. Sa théologie eucharistique n'est ni symboliste ni réaliste au sens moderne de ces termes, elle est sacramentelle." P. Th. Camelot, "Réalisme et symbolisme dans la doctrine eucharistique de S. Augustin," Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques 31 (1947), p. 410.

distinction. The Idea transcended the corporeal, never entered into it. Idea is therefore not completely synonymous with our notion of substance. For Augustine, Christ's body is present in the Eucharist as the Idea is present in the phenomenon. The Eucharist, inasmuch as it is sensible, is not the historical body of Christ, but a sign of that body.⁶⁰

In separating the Idea from its phenomenon, Plato in no way denied the reality of the material object, nor implied any spatial separation. Similarly, Augustine separated the sacramentum from the res without any denial of Christ's presence.

There is a danger in reading Augustine without a consciousness of the Platonic trend to his thought. The notions of Idea and of substance are in some ways similar: both are real beyond the reality of sensible things; both are spiritual, known only to the mind. This similarity makes it easy to read into Augustine the doctrine expressed at Trent.⁶¹ But it must be remembered that centuries of development in thought and language intervened.

In both the Carolingian and the eleventh-century eucharistic

⁶⁰Cf. texts cited on page 52. True reality is something beyond the concrete, yet the concrete is real. Above all, the separation is not spatial. "Augustine looked upon Christ's Body as being present in the Eucharist somewhat as the Platonic Idea was present in the phenomenon. The Eucharist, inasmuch as it is corporeal, is not the historical Body of Christ, but a sign of that Body. This is in complete accord with modern opinion; the sacramentum tantum is just an image of Christ's Body." Fahey, p. 155. "The symbolism of the sacraments of the New Law is best exemplified by the eucharistic body of Christ. The institution primarily aims at the presentation of the body of Christ through the species of the bread. The body of Christ is a thing with a real existence. But moreover it has a symbolical signification. First, it is a symbol of the unity of Christians in the Church. Moreover, the body of Christ is clearly a commemorative symbol of his passion. Lastly, the body of Christ, which is partaken of in the communion, is a prognostic symbol of the full enjoyment of God which is to be granted to the elect in the heavenly country." Chydenius, p. 44.

⁶¹Denz. 874; 877.

controversies, Augustine was the authority, along with Ambrose. The double influence is not doubted, but the differences between the two are often disputed. The teaching of Ambrose was considered the starting point of those who maintained the identity of the elements with the body and blood of Christ in virtue of the conversion miraculously effected by consecration--the teaching finally formulated in the doctrine of transubstantiation at the Lateran Council in 1215. Augustine was appealed to by those who distinguished the visible sign from the invisible reality, and who tended to maintain a spiritual presence of efficacy, a view which passed in its most extreme forms into a purely figurative idea of the sacrament.⁶²

Augustine is often cited as a proponent of non-realist eucharistic doctrine. Many indeed are the texts which apparently make him a mere symbolist, granting a presence in power only to the Savior under the bread and wine. He speaks of Christ holding his own body in his hands at the Last Supper. Augustine interprets the action of Christ as an exhortation to all men to imitate his humility.⁶³ It is claimed that,

⁶²"Deze sacramentsleer noemen wij de realistische. Ambrosius leert de werkelijkheid van het sacrament dank zij goddelijke consecratie; het is het lichaam van Christus zelf. . . . Het standpunt van Augustinus is niet onder één naam te vatten." Beekenkamp, 1, p. 47. "Augustin zeigt nirgends Ansätze zu einem Matabolismus. Dies stellt keinen geringen Unterschied zu den Ambrosianern dar und trug ein erstes gegensätzliches Moment in die frühmittelalterliche Eucharistielehre hinein. Warum Augustin soweit nicht kam, mag davon herrühren, dass er offenbar zu stark in den dynamischen und spiritualistischen Tendenzen eines Basilus, Gregor von Nazianz, der Abendländer Tertullian und Cyprian befangen war. Der tiefste Grund war jedoch seine platonische Denkart, die in seine Auffassung der Religion überhaupt und des sakramentalen Geschehens im besondern einen stark dualistischen Zug hineintrug." Geiselmann, p. 39-40.

⁶³Enarratio 1 in Ps. 33; PL 36, 303: "Ferebat enim illud corpus in manibus suis. Ipsa est humilitas Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ipsa multum commendatur hominibus. Ad ipsam nos hortatur, fratres, ut vivamus, id est humilitatem ejus imitemus: ut percutiamus Goliam, et tenentes Christum vincemus superbiam."

for Augustine, eating the body of Christ is a symbolical expression meaning to be united to Christ by faith and remembrance. Augustine is interpreted as saying that we eat the consecrated elements materially, but only receive the Christ symbolized by these elements by faith, i.e. in a merely spiritual way.

Yet, it would be difficult to deny the striking evidence of a true realism in the writings of the great doctor. He stresses the fact that Christ held this body in his hands as he spoke the words of consecration.⁶⁴ To speak of Christ as holding himself in his own hands is a prime example of eucharistic realism. Augustine believed it to be literally true.

Again, Augustine found in the mysteries of the Incarnation and the Eucharist the reason for adoration of the "earth". The Eucharist merits adoration, not as a symbol, but as the very flesh of Christ. Christ walked in this very flesh and gave us this same flesh to be eaten for salvation. Therefore, not only do we not sin by adoring, but we sin by not adoring.⁶⁵ Here, too, is realism.

In his preaching, Augustine taught that a sinner really receives Christ's body and blood: one who does not live in Christ, in whom Christ does not live, can carnally and visibly eat the sacrament, but he does

⁶⁴Enarratio 1 in Ps. 33; PL 36, 303: "Ferebatur enim Christus in manibus suis, quando, commendans ipsum corpus suum, ait: Hoc est corpus meum. Ferebat enim illud corpus in manibus suis."

⁶⁵Enarratio in Ps. 98,9; PL 37, 1265: "Et quia in ipsa carne hic ambulavit, et ipsam carnem nobis manducandam ad salutem dedit; nemo autem illam carnem manducat, nisi prius adoraverit; inventum est quemadmodum adoretur tale scabellum pedum Domini, et non solum non peccemus adorando, sed peccemus non adorando."

not spiritually eat the flesh of Christ.⁶⁶ The Eucharist is not a mere sign, nor a mere efficacy; it is the body of Christ. Augustine speaks not of what is eaten, but of who is eaten.⁶⁷ A person is present, not a thing. Surely, for Augustine, the Eucharist was the mystery of the real body of Christ.⁶⁸ Such passages demand a realist position. This is moreover in keeping with the tradition of the African church, and of Ambrose whom Augustine regarded so highly.⁶⁹

Yet Augustine maintained a distinction between the historical body of Christ and the eucharistic body. The historical body has ascended into heaven, is no longer on earth. He taught that the flesh which was assumed by the Word, was born of the Virgin, was apprehended by the Jews, was crucified, was buried, and was raised, "you have not always with you."

⁶⁶In Johannis Evangelium 26, 18; PL 35, 1615: "Hoc est ergo manducare illam escam, et illum bibere potum, in Christo manere, et illum manentem in se habere. Ac per hoc qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nec manducat (spiritualiter) carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, (licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus Sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi) set magis tentae rei sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducat et bibit quia immundus praesumpsit ad Christi accedere sacramenta, quae aliquis non digne sumit, nisi qui mundus est; de quibus dicitur."

⁶⁷Sermo 9,4; PL 38, 85: "Jam nosti pretium tuum, jam nosti quo accedis, quid manduces, quid bibas, imo quem manduces, quem bibas." Note the change of the neuter pronoun to indicate a change from a thing to a person.

⁶⁸"Lasst sich dies nur daraus erklären, dass für seine Betrachtungsweise die Eucharistie nicht primär das Sakrament des mystischen, sondern des realen Leibes Christi war." p. 499. "Der primäre und eigentliche Gegenstand des eucharistischen Geheimnisses ist darnach Christus allein secundum formam servi. Die Eucharistie ist primär Sakrament der Menschheit Jesu, ihrer Hingabe in den Tod." p. 503. K. Adam, "Zur Eucharistielehre des heiligen Augustinus," Theologische Quartalschrift 112 (1931), pp. 490-536.

⁶⁹Bareille, DTC, 1179. J. Tixeront, History of Dogmas, St. Louis, 1923, v. 21, p. 411. "It suffices to say that when one attacks the realism of Augustine's Eucharistic beliefs, what he is really questioning is the realism of Plato's metaphysics." Fahey, p. 158.

Christ remained bodily present with his disciples for forty days; then he ascended to the right hand of the Father.⁷⁰ For Augustine, the reality of the Eucharist could not therefore be fully identified with the historical body. The withdrawal of Christ's bodily presence was marked by the ascension; since then the historical body has been seated at the right hand of the Father.⁷¹ It remains in heaven, in place, and does not participate in the spirituality of the Word.⁷²

Augustine believed in the real presence, yet distinguished between the historical body and the eucharistic body. The Platonic theory of Ideas provides the clue to a solution of this apparent problem.⁷³

Erigena

The same Platonic trend was dominant in the thought of John Scotus

⁷⁰In Johannis Evangelium 30, 13; PL 35, 1763: "Secundum carnem vero quam Verbum assumpsit, secundum id quod de Virgine natus est, secundum id quod a Judaeis prehensus est, quod ligno confixus, quod de cruce depositus, quod linteis involutus, quod in sepulcro conditus, quod in resurrectione manifestatus, non semper habebitis vobiscum. Quare? Quoniam conversatus est secundum corporis praesentiam quadraginta diebus cum discipulis suis, et eis deducentibus videndo non sequendo, ascendit in coelum, et non est hic. Ibi est enim, sedet ad dexteram Patris: et hic est, non enim recessit praesentia majestatis."

⁷¹Sermo 131, 1; PL 38, 729: "Quid, si ergo videritis filium hominis ascendentem ubi erat prius? Certe qui integer ascendere potuit, consumi non potuit."

⁷²Ep. 187, 41; PL 33, 848: "Christum autem Dominum nostrum unigenitum Dei Filium aequalem Patri, eundemque hominis filium quo major est Pater, et ubique totum praesentem esse non dubites tanquam Deum, et in eodem templo Dei esse tanquam inhabitantem Deum, et in loco aliquo coeli propter veri corporis modum."

⁷³Thus, the doctrine of Ideas supplied for Augustine, not only an epistemological framework, but the basis of a metaphysical system as well," Fahey, p. 147-8. This is critical for his eucharistic theology since the concepts of real presence and conversion involve metaphysical principles. "since the Idea did not enter into the historical Body, but transcended it, his distinction between the Body born of Mary and the eucharistic reality was more pronounced." Fahey, p. 155.

Erigena, who perhaps had some influence on Berengarius.⁷⁴ While there is no clear link of Berengarius to Erigena, a survey of the main tenets of Erigena's thought may help to give the general atmosphere in the period preceding Berengarius. Erigena's name is mentioned often in the course of the Berengarian dispute as the author of a eucharistic treatise defended by Berengarius and condemned by the councils. In fact, it was Ratramnus, not Erigena, who wrote the treatise.⁷⁵ Erigena was esteemed at Chartres, and the constant mention of his name in connection with the thought of Berengarius may indicate some similarity of mind. At any

⁷⁴John Scotus Erigena (ca 810-877) was born in Ireland; he went to France about 840 and taught at the court of Charles the Bald. Erigena translated into Latin the works of Pseudo-Dionysius. His works are found in PL 132. Cf. Gilson, History, pp. 113-128. The best study is that of M. Cappuyns, Jean Scot Erigène, Louvain, 1933. Macdonald exaggerates the influence: pp. 45ff, 231ff. Cappuyns denies Erigena's part in the controversy of his century: "Rien des lors ne nous autorise à accorder à Jean Scot un rôle quelconque, si ce n'est celui de spectateur, sympathique plutôt à Ratramne, dans la lutte eucharistique." Erigène, p. 91. De Ghellinck gives Erigena some influence in the confusion of the roles of faith and reason: "L'influence de Jean Scot Erigène qui commence à faire parler de lui après un long siècle de silence, la doctrine de l'illumination divine des intelligences plus ou moins bien interprétée, et pas mal d'idées ou d'expressions des anciens docteurs, partiellement ou totalement faussées par leur isolement du contexte ou l'éloignement de l'époque de leur origine, nous expliquent beaucoup de ces manques de limites précises." Pour l'histoire, p. 74. Hurtevent gives Erigena a strong influence in the schools: "Une influence moderne s'exerce sur tout le XI^e siècle. C'est l'influence de Jean Scot Erigène . . . l'étude de ses traités est en vogue dans toutes les écoles." p. 36. Beekenkamp quotes the references to Erigena in Berengarius' works: pp. 36-7. He also notes some similarities of thought and expression: p. 38. Cf. J. Ebersolt, "Essai sur Bérenger de Tours et la controverse sacramentaire au XI^e siècle," Revue de l'histoire des religions 48(1903), pp. 1-42; 137-181; Geiselmann, Eucharistielehre, p. 364.

⁷⁵The question of authorship is generally considered settled by the study of Hurtevent, pp. 253-285. "Le Liber Joannes Scoti dont parlent Bérenger, Lanfranc et le synode de Verceil n'est autre en réalité que l'opuscule de Ratramne, attribué par erreur à Jean Scot." Cappuyns, Erigène, p. 89. The views of Ratramnus and Erigena had long been confused. Cappuyns, p. 93ff. Moreover, such mistakes were not uncommon -- the treatise of Heriger of Lobbes was for a long time attributed to Gerbert. Cappuyns, p. 90, n.2. Beekenkamp lists the scholars on both sides of the debate; pp. 44-45 (it is interesting to note that the latest reference is from 1929).

rate, since Erigena is said to dominate the speculative thought of his time,⁷⁶ it is plausible to suppose that he will have left his mark on Berengarius as well. A glimpse of his ideas may yield insights into eleventh-century expressions. No attempt will be made to give anything more than a quick review of some aspects of his thought.

Of particular interest to this study are Erigena's doctrines of knowledge and of being. For him, knowledge is based on the double truth that God remains inaccessible, yet manifests himself exteriorly.⁷⁷ Therefore man's knowledge of truth will come by the two-fold process of illumination and the use of his own faculties.

According to Erigena, truth is the supreme good and is attained by means of the hierarchy of intellect, reason, and the senses. Intellectual knowledge cannot be acquired; it is the result of illumination and the supernatural revelation by God. It is totally beyond the unaided capabilities of man.⁷⁸

Rational knowledge, which is proper to man and always religious, is theology. Reason, as the instrument of faith, seeks truth with the aid of the authorities of Scripture and the Fathers.⁷⁹ For Erigena, there is no problem of reason and faith, but there is a question of the relation of reason and authority. Reason is not subject to authority since authority itself proceeds from reason.

Sense knowledge is not a direct grasp of the nature of things, but an indirect one through signs. Seeing all things as reflection of divine light, Erigena considered each thing as a sign or symbol by which

⁷⁶A. Forest, "La synthèse de Jean Scot Erigène," Histoire de l'Eglise, v. 13, p. 9.

⁷⁷De divisione naturae, III; PL 122, 689.

⁷⁸De div. nat. III; PL 122, 624.

⁷⁹De div. nat. I; PL 122, 509.

God reveals himself.⁸⁰ This knowledge enables man to rise from the corporeal to the spiritual.

The theology of Erigena reflects a strong sense of the transcendence of God. God is indefinable and unknowable. Only in so far as he manifests himself in creation can he be known. He is known then as cause, not as substance. Man does not know what God is, but what he does. God makes himself visible and is created in his creatures. He enters into nature and essence; he takes a form. God begins to be another thing than himself.⁸¹

All creation proceeds from God; all is subordinated to a first cause, but all things are created through intermediaries or primordial causes. The knowledge of things is their true substance; they are more true in the divine wisdom than in themselves. This implies a recognition of the priority of essence over existence. Existence does not add a more definitive character to a thing; it is substantially what its notion is in the divine wisdom. It is possible to consider a thing in either of two ways; in existence or in thought. But the thing either way has the same nature and truly the same substance. Knowledge is truly substantial.

⁸⁰De div. nat. II; PL 122, 540. "The incorporation of historical symbolism, as a particular category, into the system of universal symbolism had been prepared by St. Augustine. The idea that historical symbolism, or typology, is a particular kind of universal symbolism is in complete harmony with the neoplatonism of Pseudo-Dionysius and his followers. According to it, all things created are symbols. Consequently, the persons and events of history are also symbols. Eriugena, the neoplatonist, presents scriptural symbolism, i.e., typology, as a particular kind of symbolism parallel with the symbolism of nature. Thus, universal symbolism is of two kinds, according to the way in which it appears, in creation, or in the history related in Holy Scripture." Chydenius, p. 19.

⁸¹De div. nat. III; PL 122, 678; 683; 689.

The being of ideas constitutes the being of substances.⁸² Against such a background, the later medieval philosophy of existence was highly original.

Erigena had a dynamic concept of being based on the idea of progression, a return to the fullness. Everything tends towards a higher form of being. This movement is expressed as substitution and formation. Conversion is the movement by which a being is turned toward a higher perfection.⁸³

The influences on Erigena's thought are many. Particularly evident are the neo-platonic expressions of Augustine, the Greek Fathers, Dionysius, Gregory of Nyssa. Erigena is not a rationalist in the sense that he makes reason dominate faith; he is an intellectualist in the sense of aspiring toward a higher knowledge, sustained by faith. Nor is he a pantheist; God is the being of things because their idea is the truth of their essence. This is a logical conclusion of intellectualism. The divine transcendence is affirmed in the expression of the double truth of a hidden God who manifests himself.⁸⁴

What Erigena tried to accomplish is a Christian interpretation of neo-platonism. Maintaining the distinctive traits of Christian thought, he nevertheless had difficulty because of the strong intellectualist tendency of his doctrine. For Erigena, essence retains priority; he never worked out a true doctrine of existence or of causality.⁸⁵

⁸²De div. nat. IV; PL 122, 774; 778-779.

⁸³De div. nat. III; PL 122, 627.

⁸⁴De div. nat. IV; PL 122, 769.

⁸⁵De div. nat. IV; PL 122, 769; 774.

The influence of Erigena's ideas was considerable in early medieval thought, particularly at the school of Chartres. Although his ideas were not understood in their deepest meaning, they nevertheless provided in many respects a foundation for medieval thought.⁸⁶

Ratramnus

The Augustinian tradition, and thus Platonic thought, carried into the Carolingian eucharistic debate. The Berengarian controversy cannot be understood without some knowledge of its roots in the ninth-century controversy. Berengarius undoubtedly followed the eucharistic theology of Ratramnus, whose work he attributed to Erigena; the opposition was always accused of agreeing with Paschasius. More probably than not, the two were not direct opponents, but wrote independently at different times. Both were highly dependent upon Augustinian thought.⁸⁷

In the Gallic church of the early ninth century, Paschasius was regarded as an innovator.⁸⁸ As we have noted, he was the first to devote an entire treatise to the subject of the Eucharist. Paschasius therein stated the fact of a change of substance from bread and wine to the body

⁸⁶Forest, *Histoire*, p. 32.

⁸⁷"Les livres de Paschase Radbert et de Ratramne eux-mêmes ne donnent pas, à notre avis, des preuves absolument incontestables affirmant qu'il ne faut voir dans le livre de Ratramne qu'une critique directe de celui de Paschase Radbert." van den Brink, p. 24. However, Fahey concludes: "Ratramn and Paschase wrote their treatises in opposition to each other. This fact has been assumed by many and denied by some. It is hoped that this historical fact is now firmly established." p. 165. For Augustinian dependence, see Geiselmann, pp. 96-141; Beekenkamp, pp. 50-52.

⁸⁸To some, he seemed an extreme realist in his identification of the historical body and the Eucharist. Others saw him as merely stating what had always been believed by the Fathers. Macdonald sees him as an innovator disrupting the stream of tradition from Augustine. p. 234. Cf. Geiselmann, pp. 144-170; 240-256.

and blood of Christ, but he did not discuss the process by which the change takes place. He did not consider it strange that the Spirit who created the man Christ without human intervention should cause the flesh and blood of Christ in the sacrament under the appearance and taste of bread and wine.⁸⁹ The substance of bread and wine is changed into the flesh and blood of Christ, so that after consecration it is not only thought to be, but truly is believed to be the flesh and blood of Christ.⁹⁰ A new creation takes place.⁹¹ The realism is evident.

Yet Paschasius remained in the Augustinian tradition. He spoke of the sacrament as symbol, figure, or sign: the sacrament, visible in the figure of the flesh of Christ, nourishes the mind and the heart by rising through faith to the invisible and spiritual.⁹² Paschasius main-

⁸⁹PL 120, 1277B: "Unde nec mirum Spiritus qui hominem Christum in utero virginis sine semine creavit, etiamsi ipse panis ac vini substantia carnem Christi et sanguinem invisibili potentia quotidie per sacramenti sui sanctificationem operatur, quamvis nec visu exterius nec gustu saporis comprehendatur." 1278C: "veritas ergo dum corpus Christi et sanguis virtute spiritus in verbo ipsius ex panis vinique substantia efficitur."

⁹⁰PL 120, 1287C: "Cogita igitur si quippiam corporeum potest esse sublimius, cum substantia panis et vini in Christi carnem et sanguinem efficaciter interius commutatur; ita ut deinceps post consecrationem jam vera Christi caro et sanguis veraciter credatur, et non aliud quam Christus panis de coelo a credentibus aestimetur."

⁹¹PL 120, 1312B: "Prius autem quam Christi corpus consecratione fiat, oblatio sacerdotis est, sicut ipse confitetur, vel cuncta familiae offerentium eam, sed in verbo et virtute Spiritus sancti nova fit creatura in corpore Creatoris ad nostrae reparationis salutem." Cf. Geiselman, pp. 158ff; 169.

⁹²PL 120, 1279B: "Sed quia illum secundum carnem coelos oportuit penetrare, ut per fidem illuc in illo renati, confidentius appeterent, reliquit nobis hoc sacramentum visibile in figuram et characterem carnis et sanguis, ut per haec mens nostra et caro nostra ad invisibilia et spiritalia capescenda per fidem uberius nutriatur."

tained that the Eucharist must be accepted as mystery or figure.⁹³ The terms "body" and "blood" are figurative, yet they are not therefore empty of a real content.⁹⁴ Paschasius was not guilty of the extreme realism which was popularly expressed at the time, to which Ratramnus objected in his treatise.

Ratramnus, the "adversary" of Paschasius,⁹⁵ is important to this study since Berengarius' doctrine is so similar to his. He was and is recognized as a logician and a theologian.⁹⁶ Recent studies have shown that he was not the pure symbolist he had been thought to be,⁹⁷ but that he handled the concept of the sacrament in a manner that was spiritual but

⁹³Ep. ad Frudegardum, PL 120, 1325B: "Et ideo si quis dicit hanc carnem et hanc sanguinem sic ipsa esse absque mysterio et sacramento, nec in figura ex parte sumendam, ut illi tunc carnales carnaliter sapientes senserunt, totum dissipat."

⁹⁴Ibid., 1353A: "Haec quippe mystica sunt in quibus veritas carnis est et sanguinis, non alterius quam Christi, in mysterio tamen et figura."

⁹⁵The difference between Paschasius and Ratramnus is more apparent than real. As was pointed out (p. 28), each approached the question from a different point, but both accepted the teaching of the Church.

⁹⁶H. Peltier, "Ratramne," DTC, 13-2, 1781. Cf. van den Brink, p. 131.

⁹⁷Macdonald interprets Ratramnus as a dynamic symbolist, for whom the actuality of the body of Christ in the sacrament is a value which produces in the recipient the effect of the body of Christ. p. 239f. Again, Macdonald is supporting his thesis which he expresses: "Throughout the two hundred years preceding the Berengarian controversy, the spiritual interpretation of the Eucharist, in the terms of dynamic symbolism, expressing a change of value in the elements after the consecration, which produced an effect upon worthy recipients--an interpretation based upon Augustinian teaching--was maintained." p. 246. Macdonald is also following the interpretation of Geiselmann, pp. 176-218. Van den Brink disagrees with Geiselmann, p. 133. And de Ghellinck judges that if Ratramnus "a des vues personnelles qui s'ecartent souvent des idées reçues, l'on ne peut le taxer d'hétérodoxie." Litterature Latine au Moyen Age, 1, Paris, 1939, p. 114.

not symbolist, real but not crude, positive but not materialistic.⁹⁸

One of his main tenets was the insistence on the Eucharist as figure, precisely to disprove the notion that Christ's body is visibly and tangibly present in the Eucharist.⁹⁹

Ratramnus made use of a great number of terms, an extensive vocabulary, in his eucharistic treatise, thus manifesting and contributing to the development of sacramental doctrine. The meaning of his terminology depends upon an understanding of his theory of knowledge. Ratramnus recognized two forms of human knowledge: sensible knowledge and faith.¹⁰⁰ His use of words reflects his theory. Thus, "corporal" is used to designate an object which is known by the perception of the senses; the same reality can be considered in its relations to the soul and to faith and then it becomes "spiritual". What is "spiritual" is therefore

⁹⁸Van den Brink, p. 132: "d'une façon spirituelle mais non symboliste, réelle mais non grossière, positive mais non matérielle." "On the one hand, he gave ample expression to Eucharistic realism. For him, the bread and wine do not exist upon the altar after consecration; the words of the priest effect a new reality, the Body and Blood of Christ. Yet . . . Ratramn showed no indication that he understood that Christ's historical Body could assume a non-corporeal mode of existence; instead, he seemed to think of corporeality as being the essential condition of that Body These were his reasons for distinguishing the Eucharist from the Body born of Mary." Fahey, p. 164.

⁹⁹Fahey examines the notions of figure and truth in detail. pp. 56-81. "To judge Ratramn's theory of the Eucharist as a figure without considering the rest of his doctrine is a fruitless task. His main purpose in the first part of the treatise was to exclude a Capharnaitic, ultra-realistic conception of the Eucharist. His statements must be weighed against this purpose." pp. 163-164.

¹⁰⁰"De la connaissance intellectuelle il n'est pas question, et cette omission est d'importance, car elle explique pour une large part les difficultés auxquelles Ratramne va se heurter quand il traitera de l'eucharistie." R. Beraudy, L'enseignement eucharistique de Ratramne moine de Corbie au IX^{ème} siècle dans le DE CORPORE ET SANGUINE DOMINI, Lyon, 1953, p. 45.

"invisible"; the "corporal" is "visible."¹⁰¹ Both types of knowledge deal with reality; what is perceived by the senses is real, as also what is perceived by faith. But the sensible is corruptible, while what is perceived by faith is incorruptible. What appears exteriorly is not the thing itself but the image of the thing; the reality is not felt but known.¹⁰²

Then, too, a reality can be apprehended sensibly in either of two ways: it is what it appears to be by its own species, or it is known by a designation drawn from species which are not its own.¹⁰³ This leads to the main terminology of Ratramnus' eucharistic teaching. "Truth" is that which is known clearly and openly by natural indications; "figure" is the disguise which at once hides a reality and manifests it.¹⁰⁴ The manner in which a reality is presented to the senses is then designated as "manifesta-

¹⁰¹DCSD 71; van den Brink, p. 52: "Patenter insinuat quo inter se differunt quantum differunt spiritalia et corporalia visibilia et invisibilia divina atque humana et quod a se differunt non idem sunt." Cf. Beraudy, pp. 52-61.

¹⁰²DCSD 77; van den Brink, pp. 53-54: "Sed aliud est quod exterius geritur aliud vero quod per fidem creditur. Ad sensum quod pertinent corporis corruptibile est, quod fides vero credit incorruptibile. Exterius igitur quod apparet non est ipsa res sed imago rei mente vero quod sentitur et intellegitur veritas rei."

¹⁰³DCSD 72; van den Brink, p. 52: "Secundum quod exterius conspiciatur atque aliud secundum quod in misterio creditur. Porro caro Christi quae crucifixa est non aliud quam quod interius erat ostendebat quia vera caro veri hominis existebat corpus utique verum in veri corporis specie consistens." *Ibid.* 16; p. 37: "Non quod duarum sint existentiae rerum inter se diversarum, corporis videlicet et spiritus, verum una eademque res secundum aliud species panis et vini consistit, secundum aliud autem corpus est et sanguis Christi."

¹⁰⁴DCSD 7; van den Brink, p. 34: "Figura est obumbratio quaedam quibusdam velaminibus quod intendit ostendens." *Ibid.* 8; p. 34-35: "Veritas vero est rei manifestae demonstratio nullis umbrarum imaginibus obvelatae sed puris et apertis utque planius eloquamur naturalibus significationibus insinuatae."

tion," clearly and openly, or "similitude," by interposing a likeness.¹⁰⁵

Ratramnus had recourse to the notions of "figure" and "sacrament" to explain the fact of the eucharistic presence. The reality is known exteriorly through the senses, but interiorly through faith. The visible renders the invisible present. The Platonism is quite evident, but in distinctly Augustinian garb.¹⁰⁶

In fact, Ratramnus served to renew the understanding of Augustinian concepts in a developing philosophical milieu. A large measure of his originality in theological method was the use of logic in the understanding and explicitation of matters of faith.¹⁰⁷ In this he is considered a

¹⁰⁵DCSD 86; van den Brink, p. 56: "Et pignus enim et imago alterius rei sunt, id est non ad se sed ad aliud aspiciunt. Pignus enim illius rei est pro qua donatur imago illius cuius similitudinem ostendit. Significant enim ista rem cuius sunt, non manifeste ostendunt. Quod cum ita est apparet quod hoc corpus et sanguis pignus et imago rei sunt futurae ut quod nunc per similitudinem ostenditur in futuro per manifestationem reveletur. Quod si nunc significant in futuro autem patefacient, aliud est quod nunc geritur aliud quod in futuro manifestabitur." According to Augustinian thought, in a particular sign, the quality of being a thing with a signification of its own may be more or less overshadowed by the quality of signifying something else. According to the degree in which the quality as thing or sign is more or less prominent, two different kinds of signs can be distinguished. The first kind consists of those signs whose quality as things is equally pronounced as that of sign. The second kind consists of those things whose entire significance lies in the fact that they signify something else. Chydenius, p. 7.

¹⁰⁶"Whenever he abandoned the true thought of his authorities, it was always to give expression to some belief dear to Augustine. It was this loyalty which caused him to misread Ambrose, overstate the case of Jerome, pass by the clear expressions of Isidore and Fulgentius. . . . by a process of exclusion we have limited the principal source of Ratramn's beliefs to the Doctor of the Eucharist, Saint Augustine." Fahey, p. 55.

¹⁰⁷"Il fut surtout un dialecticien; il savait définir les termes dont il se servait, et donner ainsi aux notions une certaine consistance; il savait aussi conduire une argumentation avec rigueur et subtilité." Beraudy, p. 4. "He lays down his line of reasoning in almost syllogistic

precursor of the scholastic method.¹⁰⁸

The question of the identity of the historical and eucharistic body of Christ was central to the ninth-century dispute.¹⁰⁹ The philosophy which influenced the Carolingian writers was Platonism, coming to them mainly through Augustine. The eucharistic doctrine, too, came predominantly from Augustine. The divergence and consequent argumentation was caused by the purpose for which each man wrote: Paschasius to instruct the monks; Ratramnus to answer a theological inquiry of the court. Thus Paschasius found Augustine a source of simple faith. Ratramnus drew from the same source a sacramental theory filled with Platonic overtones.

Berengarius, too, had the highest regard for Plato.¹¹⁰ The key to his thought may well emerge from this Platonic tendency. In examining his eucharistic doctrine, it will be well to note the indications of Platonic content and Aristotelian method, a heritage from the school of Chartres.

form. The pivotal passage is found in the seventy-first chapter:

Things that are different are not identical.

But the eucharistic Flesh and Blood differ from
the Flesh and Blood which hung upon Calvary.

Therefore, they are not the same.

The remainder of the treatise is devoted to an explanation of the minor of this argument." Fahey, p. 46.

¹⁰⁸"Die streng durchgeführte Disposition und Systematik und die Anlehnung an die aristotelische Philosophie in der Auffassung und Verwertung der in der damaligen Kontroverse viel gebrauchten Begriffe *veritas* et *figura* lassen diese Schrift als einen trefflichen Anlauf zur scholastischen Methode erscheinen." M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte*, t. 1, p. 201.

¹⁰⁹Cf. Geiselman, pp. 144-283; Fahey, pp. 82-129.

¹¹⁰DSC, 14, p. 24.

Political Pressures

At the time of Berengarius the political situation of Europe was confused and precarious.¹¹¹ The great Teutonic empires of Charlemagne and Otto had crumbled each in its turn. Leadership was passing gradually into the hands of the French. Nations were emerging, yet monarchs were by no means secure. It was still an era of force, where the best army was the source of the greatest power. But it was also an era of intrigue, with alliances and enmities shifting constantly. Of all this, the Church was very much a part. A temporal power, supposedly sovereign and supreme, the Church depended upon alliances with the strongest powers to maintain her own positions. She was very much indebted to a variety of allies for past instances of protection and rescue. It was thus a very ticklish business to reprimand these same kings and nobles for their practices of investiture and simony, as well as other dealings involving Church members and property. And it was all but impossible to establish any practical idea of a universal Church with immediate authority over all Christians and each Christian.

A few incidents may serve to illustrate the extent of influence which political affairs exerted in the fate of Berengarius' theological teachings.

Berengarius' teaching had been summarily condemned at the council of Rome in 1050, and Berengarius had been asked to appear at the council of Vercelli to answer the charges. Since the king, Henry I, held the title of abbot of St. Martin of Tours,¹¹² Berengarius applied for permission to

¹¹¹A. Fliche, La réforme grégorienne et la reconquête chrétienne, Histoire de l'Eglise, v. 8, Paris, 1950; H. Daniel-Rops, The Church in the Dark Ages, v. 2, New York, 1960.

¹¹²During the latter part of the ninth century, the occupancy of the abbacy fell first to a member of the royal house and then to the king of France himself. Cf. Macdonald, p. 23.

travel to Italy. According to some historians, Henry was anxious to discourage papal intervention within his realm. He would have thought it better to settle such a matter at a French synod. At any rate, he refused the permission and gave Berengarius into the custody of one of his nobles.

Henry was also at odds with Geoffrey of Anjou, the powerful protector of Berengarius. When Henry called a council in Paris, Berengarius did not attend for fear of death, not an uncommon fate of heretics in his day. A letter of his was read, and he was condemned as heretical. Thereupon, an army was sent to find Berengarius and either force him to submit or execute him as a heretic. Thus Henry had an excuse for his army to invade the territory of Anjou.

Yet, once peace was established between Henry and Anjou, Berengarius had nothing to fear from the condemnations of Vercelli and Paris. His quite general profession of faith was readily accepted at a synod of 1054.

Later, after the death of Geoffrey, Berengarius was forced to submit under penalty of death. Having no powerful protector, he found none of his former allies willing to support him publicly.

The popes of the eleventh century were too much involved in political events to resist their influence. The young teacher was under the protection of a strong bishop, Eusebius Bruno of Angers; a powerful noble, Geoffrey of Anjou; and was a canon of St. Martin of Tours whose official abbot was the king himself. Any pope attempting to deal with Berengarius thus found himself in the midst of political situations on all levels.

Pope Leo IX was striving to establish the authority of the Roman curia over the French bishops. The questions of appointment of eccle-

siastical office, of investiture, of simony, and of clerical marriage were all subjects of dispute between the French court and the papacy. Leo sought particularly for recognition of his own authority by the king and his powerful nobles. Henry steadfastly refused such recognition, even in the matter of ecclesiastical synods. Geoffrey had such little regard for papal authority that he imprisoned, and continued to detain against papal protest, a bishop of the Church. In such circumstances, Leo did not explicitly condemn their protege Berengarius at an early council in Rheims, but he did excommunicate the "new heretics in Gaul", together with their followers and their protectors.¹¹³

Berengarius himself showed no evidence of political interest. Throughout his writings he refers only to the theological aspects of the controversy. Yet it would seem that he proved useful in the disputes between the papacy and the king. He was totally lacking in respect for the individuals who, to his mind, abused the authority of these positions.

Conclusions

Berengarius belonged to the intellectual elite of his century. He was educated at the best of the cathedral schools, well-versed in both secular and sacred authors. His philosophical thought was Platonic, his logical method Aristotelian. As a Chartrian scholar, he had been trained in a literal interpretation of Scripture and a reliance upon the authority of the Fathers.

But he was also a man for whom the roles of faith and reason had not yet been clearly delineated. As so many others of his century would

¹¹³PL 142, 1437B.

do, he sought to understand the faith, not to prove it or deny it. The controversies resulting from his intellectual endeavor contributed to a shift from belief in the reality of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist to a determined defense of the objective presence of his body.¹¹⁴ In the development of eucharistic doctrine, such a defense brought about a clarification of the points at issue, but the emphasis tended to somewhat distort the eucharistic action for many of the faithful.

There can be no doubt that Augustine played a decisive role in the shaping of Berengarius' eucharistic thought. It is evident in the course of this study that his ideas of both sacramentum and of corpus are Augustinian. In fact, the concept of sacramentum as visible and tangible is the basis for Berengarius' attack on Lanfranc. And the notion of the risen body as in loco is the foundation for the argument as to what type of change is possible.

The treatise of Ratramnus expresses, by Berengarius' own admission, his way of thinking about the Eucharist. Perhaps the most interesting feature is the similarity of their language and of their interpretation according to a specific theory of knowledge. Again, a study of the text reveals that the very key to Berengarius' doctrine lies in the relation of knowledge and being. It is at least possible that Erigena prepared the ground in this area.

In considering eucharistic presence, all writers who preceded Berengarius came upon the question of body. They generally agreed that the species are the body of Christ. But it is a difficult matter to explain the relationship by which a true presence is maintained, by which

¹¹⁴"C'est que la théologie de l'Eucharistie devient de plus en plus autour d'une défense de la 'présence réelle'. L'apologie du dogme succède à l'intelligence de la foi." de Lubac, Corpus, p. 247.

Christ's body which is "up there" is really "down here." Berengarius, in the light of his background, explains the relation of the visible sign to the unseen reality in terms of participation and likeness.

A study of the manner of eucharistic presence and the origin of that presence in the thought of Berengarius, then, involves 1) his proximate motivation in the attack by Lanfranc; 2) some aspects of his method; 3) his understanding of sacramentum; 4) the meaning he gives to corpus; 5) what he considers to be present in the Eucharist and in what way it is present; and 6) the process by which this presence is effected.

By the testimony of his contemporaries, Berengarius was a man of independent temperament. Initiative to any degree and in any field was not viewed kindly by a Church whose authority was challenged on every side. He found himself condemned time after time without even being heard. It is the intent of this study to give him a hearing: to read him in the light of Platonic metaphysics and Aristotelian logic, the Christian influence of Augustine, and the aggravating effect of unfortunate experiences. In this light, it may be possible to see what, if anything, is distinctly berengarian in his eucharistic teaching. It may lead to a clearer understanding of the concepts he was struggling to express and of the errors he was determined to resist.

CHAPTER III

THE CHALLENGE OF LANFRANC

Method

Fortunately, Lanfranc was quite explicit as to why he wrote his treatise, De Corpore et Sanguine Domini. It was in opposition to the teaching of Berengarius, particularly to the specific work which Berengarius wrote following his condemnation at Rome in 1059.¹ The treatise is therefore a valuable source for both the historical facts of the controversy and the points of issue in the doctrinal debate. No attempt is made here to evaluate the position of Lanfranc. It is hoped that a presentation of his statements will serve to clarify the position taken by Berengarius on certain points of eucharistic doctrine.

The tone of the argument was set immediately as Lanfranc brought one accusation after another against Berengarius. In Lanfranc's opinion, Berengarius had deliberately chosen to be perverse. Further, he had attempted to mislead others by holding secret disputations among the students. These, not knowing enough to resist Berengarius, had been taught a false principle, particularly injurious to sacramental doctrine: to contemplate what was seen, not the unseen. Such perverse doctrines

¹Upon returning to France after the Roman synod of 1059, Berengarius regretted his weakness in submitting to the oath imposed upon him. He composed a refutation in the form of a pamphlet against the proceedings. It is this writing which Lanfranc refutes in detail in his De corpore et sanguine Domini. Cf. Cappuyns, DHGE, 393.

had been widely circulated through Berengarius' disciples.² Clearly Lanfranc was incensed by such conduct on the part of a professed teacher of truth.

A more serious charge against Berengarius was that he made a false confession of faith before the Roman synod. Lanfranc charged that while Berengarius submitted outwardly to the profession of faith demanded by the assembled bishops, he believed differently in his heart.³ Lanfranc contended that it was only from fear of death that Berengarius proclaimed the true doctrine. At the time, Berengarius threw the condemned books on the fire and swore to teach nothing contrary to the faith. But as soon as he reached the safety of his own territory, Berengarius retracted all his statements of submission and wrote vehemently against the declaration of the synod.

It was Lanfranc's intention to refute the statements of Berengarius, quoting them verbatim and answering each in turn. Again, it is fortunate that Lanfranc adopted such a plan, for there is not an existing copy of Berengarius' document. It will be seen later that the passages Lanfranc quotes are in full accord, and often identical, with the statements in Berengarius' later work, De Sacra Coena.

²PL 150, 408A: "quia eligisti pravitatem." 408A: "clandestinis disputationibus apud imperitos tueri." 409A: "Quo peccato plurimum detineris, subvertens eos qui, nescientes tibi resistere, contemplantur ea quae videntur, non ea quae non videntur." 409B: "nisi etiam prava scripta per praves discipulos tuos in diversas regiones transmittas."

³PL 150, 409B: "Tu quoque inclinato corpore, sed non humiliato corde, ignem accendisti, librosque perversi dogmatis in medio sancti concilii in eum coniecisti, jurans, per id quod rebus omnibus incomparabiliter majus est, fidem, a Patribus qui praesentes erant traditam, inviolabiliter te servaturum, veteremque doctrinam tuam de corpore et sanguine Domini, ab illa die, aliis non praedicaturum."

At the council of Rome summoned by Pope Nicholas in 1059, Berengarius had been forced to repeat an oath composed by Cardinal Humbert.⁴ In it, he was compelled to renounce the heresy he was accused of teaching: that the bread and wine, after consecration, are only a sacrament and not the true body and blood of Christ. In the presence of the assembled bishops, Berengarius affirmed the faith of the Church: that the bread and wine become truly (verum) the body and blood of Christ and are perceptibly (sensualiter) on the altar. Later Berengarius retracted this statement and vigorously defended his position on the sacrament, on the true body of Christ, and on the perceptible presence of the bread. He was equally forceful in denying any type of gross materiality in

⁴Humbert was a monk of the Lotharingian monastery of Moyenmoutier. In 1050, Leo IX created him Cardinal-Bishop of Silva Candida. He became one of the principal advisers of the pope especially in matters of ecclesiastical reform. He is generally credited with composing the oath imposed upon Berengarius. PL 150, 410D: "Ego Berengarius, indignus diaconus Ecclesiae Sancti Mauricii Andegavensis, cognoscens veram catholicam et apostolicam fidem, anathematizo omnem haeresim, praecipue eam de qua hactenus infamatus sum, quae astruere conatur panem et vinum quae in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem solummodo sacramentum, et non verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse, nec posse sensualiter in solo sacramento manibus sacerdotum tractari, vel frangi, aut fidelium dentibus atteri. Consentio autem sanctae Romanae et apostolicae sedi, et ore et corde profiteor de sacramentis Dominicae mensae eam fidem tenere quam dominus et venerabilis papa Nicolaus, et haec sancta synodus auctoritate evangelica et apostolica tenendam tradidit, mihiq[ue] firmavit; scilicet panem et vinum quae in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse, et sensualiter non solum sacramento, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi et fidelium dentibus atteri, jurans per sanctam et homousion Trinitatem, et per haec sacrosancta Christi Evangelia. Eos vero qui contra hanc fidem venerint, cum dogmatibus et sectatoribus suis aeterno anathemate dignos esse pronuntio. Quod si ego ipse aliquando aliquid contra haec sentire aut praedicare praesumpsero, subiaceam canonum severitati. Lecto et perlecto sponte subscripsi." Bonaventure called this profession of faith an excessive formulation. In IV Sent., d. 12, p. 1, a. 3, q. 1. Thomas reinterpreted the oath. Summa Theologica, III, 77, 7: "And the confession made by Berengarius is to be understood in this sense, that the breaking and the crushing with the teeth is to be referred to the sacramental species, under which the body of Christ truly is."

interpretation of the presence of the body of Christ--he could not allow a perceptible presence of the flesh and blood.⁵

In his later retraction, Berengarius was most scathing in his remarks about Humbert. Lanfranc leapt to the defense of the cardinal, saying that the oath was not representative of only his personal thought but of that of the whole Church. The pope and the bishops fully agreed with it. For Lanfranc, any man was a heretic who was not in full accord with the teaching of the Church expressed in the official doctrine, in the writings of the Fathers and the doctors of the Church, and in the widely-held opinions of Christians.⁶

Lanfranc accused Berengarius of not meaning a word of what he said. He considered it the height of folly for any man, particularly a learned man, to say words which did not coincide with his belief. As far as Lanfranc was concerned, Berengarius had merely recited the words, so that they were not his own. It was for this very reason that Hildebrand had earlier required Berengarius to take an oath explicitly from the heart as well as from the mouth.⁷

⁵Durandus of Troarn reports several tales of extreme realism regarding the flesh and blood of Christ present in the Eucharist: PL 149, 1418A; 1418D; 1419A.

⁶PL 150, 410B: "Quem dum contra catholicam veritatem scripsisse asseris, non ipsum solum, sed et Romanos pontifices, Romanam Ecclesiam multosque sanctos Patres redarguis, incurrisque in illud quod beati doctores, si non eisdem verbis, eisdem tamen sententiis multis in locis concorditer astruxerunt, haereticum esse omnem hominem qui a Romana et universali Ecclesia, in fidei doctrina, discordat."

⁷Hildebrand held influential posts in papal employ from 1046 until his own election to the papacy in 1073 as Gregory VII. He was sent to Tours by Leo IX to conduct a synod which handled among other things the Berengarian affair. PL 150, 411C: "Ego Berengarius corde

After Berengarius affirmed the faith of the Church, Nicholas hoped to settle the affair by circulating Berengarius' submission to all the towns of Italy, Gaul, and Germany where his influence might have been felt. Again Lanfranc released Humbert from any singularity in an opinion which was obviously that of the whole Church.⁸ He reproached Berengarius for singling out one man rather than opposing the whole Church.⁹

Lanfranc supplied further details of the controversy. He traced the issue through the synods of three popes. Leo IX had presided at the assembly of bishops and abbots who heard Berengarius' letter to Lanfranc read. The synod heard Berengarius praise Erigena and condemn Paschasius, endangering, so they thought, the common faith in the Eucharist.¹⁰ The

credo et ore confiteor panem et vinum, quae ponuntur in altari, per mysterium sacrae orationis et verba nostri Redemptoris substantialiter converti in veram, et propriam, vivificatricem carnem et sanguinem Jesu Christi Domini nostri, et post consecrationem esse verum corpus Christi, quod natum est de Virgine, et quod pro salute mundi oblatum in cruce pependit, et quod sedet ad dextram Patris; et verum sanguinem Christi, qui de latere ejus effusus est, non tantum per signum et virtutem sacramenti, sed in proprietate naturae et veritate substantiae, sicut in hoc brevi continetur, et ego legi, et vos intellexistis. Sic credo, nec contra hanc fidem ulterius docebo; sic me Deus adjuvet, et haec sacra Evangelia." Hildebrand was always friendly toward Berengarius, and it was he who presided at the final settlement of the affair at the council of Rome in 1079.

⁸PL 150, 412A: "Cur ergo scriptum hoc magis ascribitur Humberto episcopo quam tibi, quam Nicolao pontifici, quam ejus concilio, quam denique omnibus Ecclesiis quae id cum debita reverentia susceperunt, et pro conversione tua Deo gratias retulerunt?"

⁹PL 150, 412A: "Cur inquam, nisi quia facilius persuades imperitis potuisse unum hominem errare quam tot personas, tot Ecclesias?"

¹⁰PL 150, 413B: "Igitur cum a quodam Remensi clerico Roman perlatas recitator legeret, intellecto quod Joannem Scotum extolleret, Paschasium damnaret, communis de eucharistia fidei adversa sentiret, promulgata est in te damnationis sententia, privans te communione sanctae Ecclesiae, quam tu privare sancta ejus communione satagebas."

first condemnation was proclaimed against Berengarius. Since the letter had been addressed to Lanfranc, he was called upon to defend himself. Berengarius was summoned to present his defense at Vercelli in the following September.

Lanfranc described the events at Vercelli, where Berengarius was again not present. A passage of Erigena's book was read and condemned; Berengarius' opinion was exposed and likewise condemned; the faith of the Church was affirmed.¹¹ Again, Berengarius was given an opportunity to defend himself, at the next council to be held at Tours.

Authority

The question of authority played a primary role in Lanfranc's refutation of the teaching of Berengarius. It was Lanfranc's contention that Berengarius not only rejected the authority of Humbert, of the popes and bishops of the council, of the common faith of the universal Church, of the Fathers of the Church; he also accused Berengarius of false interpretations of the authorities he cited for his position.

Berengarius had vehemently repudiated the ideas of Humbert, Paschasius, and Lanfranc. The latter charged him with schism for denying what was taught by Humbert, a cardinal and a believer with the Church.¹²

¹¹ PL 150, 413C: "In qua, in audientia omnium qui de diversis hujus mundi partibus illuc convenerant, Joannis Scoti liber De eucharistia lectus est, ac damnatus, sententia tua exposita ac damnata, fides sanctae Ecclesiae, quam ego teneo et tenendam astruo, audita et concordi omnium assensu confirmata."

¹² PL 150, 414A: "Erat autem Burgundus in sententia catholicae Ecclesiae, sed non in mea, meorumque sequacium, qui malimus nos ab ea superbe separare, et contra ad nostram perniciem schisma facere quam humiliter membra ejus esse, et communem cum ea fidem salubriter retinere." Cf. Amann and Gaudel, DTC, 8-1, 2565: It is not a question of rejecting an individual, or a choice between two theologies, it is a matter of thinking with the Church or against it.

In contrast, Lanfranc based his own belief in the Eucharist on the authority of God. He accepted and confessed the belief of the Church, for a member of the Church ought not to discredit the Church.¹³ He grounded his faith in the testimony of the Fathers, particularly that of Ambrose and Augustine. Thus, Lanfranc was particularly riled when Berengarius attacked the Church, calling it the see of Satan.¹⁴ He was truly aggravated at the thought of a scholar who could place himself in opposition to the belief of the Church through all ages, in all places, to the witness of the Fathers, of the Scriptures, of the popes.¹⁵ To support his argument, Lanfranc quoted texts of the Mass, the works of Paul, Gregory, Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome.¹⁶

Lanfranc also refused to accept the arguments of human knowledge to contradict faith, charging that Berengarius reasoned from human wisdom, not divine.¹⁷ He held firmly to the medieval tradition that reason was to be used to understand the faith. In no way could reason deny the witness of the Church. Even reasonably, Berengarius should concede, for if what he taught was true, then the Church and all the people held a false belief.¹⁸

¹³PL 150, 417A: / 419A: "Sed testis mihi Deus est, . . . Membrum Ecclesiae ab Ecclesia discrepare non debuit."

¹⁴PL 150, 426A: "Revera non sanctam Ecclesiam experta est veritas ipsa, sed Ecclesiam malignantium, concilium vanitatis, nec apostolicam, sed sedem Satanae."

¹⁵PL 150, 435.

¹⁶PL 150, 436; 437; 438.

¹⁷PL 150, 439C: "Hoc vos colligitis secundum humanam sapientiam, non secundum divinam."

¹⁸PL 150, 440D: "Si verum est quod de corpore Christi tu credis et astruis, falsum est quod ab Ecclesia ubique gentium de eadem re deditur et astringitur."

But in faith, Berengarius would have to admit that the universal Church cannot have a false faith or the promises of God would be false.¹⁹

Use of Texts

It is a serious charge to accuse a scholar of the misuse of texts. Yet, this was precisely what Lanfranc said of Berengarius, and in no uncertain terms. Calling him a "demented mind" and an "impudent liar," Lanfranc charged Berengarius with attributing to Ambrose a text which does not appear anywhere in Ambrose's writings.²⁰ Furthermore, Lanfranc went to some lengths to show that Berengarius had taken the wrong meaning from Ambrose and Augustine. Lanfranc quotes Berengarius as claiming that Ambrose believed the bread to remain after consecration, since he said bread and wine are what they were and are changed into something else.²¹ Lanfranc denied that any such statement was to be found in all the writings of Ambrose. Moreover, he held that the principle was always to be observed of considering a text within its context. Lanfranc showed that Ambrose brought out the idea of God's preparation of the people for such a great mystery through figures; the examples of change in the Old Testament which give deeper understanding to the eucharistic conversion; the power of

¹⁹PL 150, 441.

²⁰PL 150, 419C: "O mentem amentem! o hominem impudenter mentientem! o puniendam temeritatem! Ambrosium testem accire praesumis, quod panis et vinum altaris per consecrationem non desinunt esse quod erant, sed commutantur in aliud quod non erant. Et quidem si de sacramentis seu caeteris de quibus Ambrosius scripsit omnes revolvās libros quos Ecclesia in usu nunc habet, tale aliquid ab Ambrosio dictum, taliterque expositum nusquam reperire valebit." Cf. Ambrose, *De sacramentis*, 4, 4, 14-15; Botte, pp. 82-83.

²¹PL 150, 419C: "Per consecrationem altaris fiunt panis et vinum sacramentum religionis, non ut desinant esse quae erant, sed ut sint quae erant, et in aliud commutantur quod dicit beatus Ambrosius in libro *De sacramentis*."

the word of God in creating from nothing.²² It is this same powerful word which works the change in the Eucharist.²³ Lanfranc charged that Berengarius had misinterpreted Ambrose, who was contrasting the power of the word in creation with the eucharistic word.²⁴

As Berengarius had misinterpreted Ambrose on the change that takes place in the Eucharist, so, Lanfranc charged, he had altered the meaning of certain statements of Augustine regarding sacrament. Thus, while he agreed with Berengarius that Augustine defined a sacrament as a sacred sign, Lanfranc insisted that this statement be read in the context which referred not to the Eucharist but to the Old Testament sacrifices, for Augustine's actual statement dealt with sacrifice.²⁵ Berengarius' version was not accurate.²⁶ Furthermore, Lanfranc contended, when Augustine

²²PL 150, 420.

²³PL 150, 420D: "Esse quidem secundum visibilem speciem testatur quae erant, commutari vero secundum interiorem essentiam in naturam illarum rerum quae antea non erant."

²⁴PL 150, 421A: "Sermo ergo Christi, qui potuit ex nihilo facere quod non erat non potest ea quae sunt in id mutare quod non erant."

²⁵PL 150, 422C: "Verumtamen beatus Augustinus in libro De civitate Dei (lib. x, c. 5, tom. V) non ita abrupte, ut tu dicis, sacramentum sacrum esse signum definivit. Nihil vero eo in loco de corpore et sanguine Domini loquebatur, sed tractans de ritu Judaicorum sacrificiorum, quod, per sacrificia quae viderentur, res invisibiles, per quas humanae societati ad diligendum Deum proximumque consulitur, significarentur, paucis approbatam sententiam conclusit, dicens: 'Sacrificium ergo visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, id est, sacrum signum est.'" J. de Ghellinck cites Lanfranc incorrectly as saying: "visibile sacrificium invisibile sacramentum, i.e., sacrum signum." He thus credits Lanfranc with an important transformation of the definition given by Augustine. Actually it was Ivo of Chartres who made the change which was perpetuated in twelfth-century compilations. Lanfranc cited Augustine correctly. "Un chapitre dans l'histoire de la définition des sacrements au XII^e siècle," *Mélanges Mandonnet* II, p. 86. Cf. D. Van den Eynde, "Les définitions des sacrements pendant la première période de la théologie scolastique," *Antonianum* 24(1949), p. 192.

²⁶PL 150, 422B.

concluded in that passage that a visible sacrifice is a sacrament of an invisible sacrifice, it is necessary to examine his later words in order to determine the meaning of the invisible as an interior sacrifice of the heart.²⁷

Dialectics

Having questioned the validity of Berengarius' arguments on the two counts of the use of authority and the accurate interpretation of texts, Lanfranc challenged Berengarius' special territory, the logic of his argument and his use of words. He quoted Berengarius as stating his argument thus: Whoever says: The bread and wine of the altar are only sacraments; or the bread and wine of the altar are only the true body and blood of Christ, in any case maintains that the bread and wine remain.²⁸

It is typical of Lanfranc that, after stating the problem, he does not proceed to handle it but rather contests the authenticity of the statements involved, although this was not the point of Berengarius' argument. He accused Berengarius of holding the first, that bread and wine are nothing more than sacraments; he denied that anyone held the second, that bread and wine are not symbols but only the true body and blood of Christ. Taking the statements out of context, ignoring the purpose of Berengarius' argumentation, leads Lanfranc to accuse Berengarius of holding that bread and wine are only sacraments. The whole point of the argument is lost and false accusations are made.

²⁷PL 150, 422D: "Non vult ergo Deus sacrificium trucidati pecoris, sed vult sacrificium contriti cordis."

²⁸PL 150, 414D: "Qui enim dicit: Panis et vinum altaris solummodo sacramenta sunt: vel panis et vinum altaris solummodo sunt verum Christi corpus et sanguis, modis omnibus panem et vinum superesse constituit." Evidently Lanfranc was given the task of destroying Berengarius' writings, which would explain his ability to quote the text which no longer exists.

Lanfranc poses a second problem, claiming that words were the cause of Berengarius' downfall.²⁹ Again, he does not follow through on the charge but proceeds to condemn Berengarius, not on the basis of the words he used, but on his subjective conviction. Lanfranc accused Berengarius of perjury, saying he believed other than he said.

The faulty argumentation resulted in charges of heresy. Lanfranc related that when Pope Nicholas learned of Berengarius' teaching that bread and wine remain after consecration, he called Berengarius to defend himself. Berengarius did not appear, and again an oath was proposed,³⁰ which Berengarius was to profess or he would be sentenced to death. The point at issue was still the alleged heresy of Berengarius, that bread and wine after consecration are only a sacrament, not the true body and blood of Christ. The Church was not interested in the subtleties of argumentation, but in the reality of the bodily presence of Christ.

Lanfranc cites another example of Berengarius' logical argumentation: calling Christ a cornerstone does not destroy Christ, but rather declares that he is. So, too, calling bread a sacrament, or calling bread the body of Christ, does not destroy the bread, but rather confirms its existence.³¹

²⁹PL 150, 415B: "In praesentia tantum suscepi ostendere verba Romani concilii, quae te servaturum jurejurando firmasti, nulla a se invicem contrarietate differre. Arguentibus enim te amicis ac necessariis tuis quod aut non servanda jurare non debueris, aut jurata servare, infamare soles Nicolaum pontificem reliquosque Patres Romani concilii, videlicet quod, docentes ac scientes contraria, tui fuerunt causa perjurii."

³⁰PL 150, 415C: "Ego Berengarius anathematizo eam haeresim, de qua hactenus infamatus sum, quae astruere conatur panem et vinum, quae in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem, solummodo sacramentum, et non verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse."

³¹PL 150, 416.

Lanfranc rejected this argumentation, looking upon it as merely an example of figurative speech. In fact, said Lanfranc, this example was more fitting as an argument for him. He turned it into a different form of reasoning by claiming that no one intended by the example to call Christ a stone, but rather to point out a certain similarity. Lanfranc compared it to the scriptural designation of the body of Christ as bread, turning the argument from the validity of calling bread the body of Christ to the validity of calling the body of Christ bread.³²

It is to be noted that Lanfranc did not despise the art of dialectics; he rather delighted in the mental exercise. With evident relish, he disputed a point with his colleague. When Berengarius continued to maintain the presence of bread after consecration, this time basing his argument on the premise that not every proposition can stand when part had been overthrown,³³ Lanfranc chided him for invalid argumentation since Berengarius proposed a negative particular for his major premise, from which no valid conclusion could be drawn.³⁴ Lanfranc went on to accuse Berengarius of avoiding the issue of doctrine by retreating to dialectics, turning to consideration of affirmations, predicates, subjects,

³²PL 150, 416C: "eodem modo cum divina pagina corpus Domini panem vocat, sacrata ac mystica locutione id agit, seu, quoniam ex pane conficitur ejusque nonnullas retinent qualitates; seu, quia animam incomprehensibiliter pascendo satiat eique aeternae vitae substantiam subministrat."

³³PL 150, 416D: "Non enim constare poterit affirmatio omnis, parte subruta; et hoc, sicut dicit beatus Augustinus in libro De doctrina Christiana: 'In ipsa aeternitatis veritate, quae Deus est, indissolubiliter constat.'" Lanfranc again accuses Berengarius of using texts out of context to support his own argument: 418B.

³⁴PL 150, 417-418. Macdonald, Berengar, pp. 292-293, gives a brief account of the discussion of logicians on this charge.

and such.³⁵

When Berengarius accused Humbert of actually declaring for the existence of the bread and wine after consecration, and of saying they are not symbols but only the body and blood of Christ, Lanfranc did not deign to argue, but vehemently denied the accusation.³⁶

Berengarius reverted to argumentation from the use of words. He referred to the frequent use by the Fathers of such words as "species," "likeness," "figure," "sign," or "sacrament" in speaking of the Eucharist. But, he argued, such words denote something other than the apparent object. Therefore, he said, what is seen is not the body of Christ.³⁷ Lanfranc scornfully told Berengarius that he did not know what he was talking about. The words "species" and "likeness" referred to the elements before the consecration, which become flesh and blood, as was clear in the texts of the Mass and the testimony of Gregory, Augustine, and Ambrose.³⁸ No one doubted the likeness which referred to the species of bread and wine under which the bodily nature of Christ is hidden.

When Berengarius argued from the impossibility of the alternatives of bread being taken up to heaven to become body, or of body coming down to earth to become bread, Lanfranc offered no answer except that from authority; believe the Church; use reason to understand, but not to deny.³⁹

³⁵"bientôt ce sera l'inverse: on tiendra pour négligeables ceux qui fuient la dialectique." de Lubac, Corpus, p. 256.

³⁶PL 150, 419C.

³⁷PL 150, 436A: "Adversus tantam divinarum auctoritatum lucem quaestionis caliginem opponere non desistis dicens: Quod tu verum Christi corpus esse asseris, in sacris litteris appellatur species, similitudo, figura, signum, mysterium, sacramentum. Haec autem vocabula ad aliquid sunt. Nulla vero, quae ad aliquid referuntur, possunt esse id quod sunt ea ad quae referuntur. Non est igitur corpus Christi."

³⁸PL 150, 436; 437; 438

³⁹PL 150, 439-440.

In regard to method, Lanfranc thus accused Berengarius of reliance on human reason above faith, of disregard for authority, of inaccuracy both in the quotation of texts and in their interpretation, of illogical argumentation, and of hypocrisy in the use of words. Berengarius' answer is contained in the De Sacra Coena.

Doctrine

Lanfranc was one of the main representatives of orthodoxy in the dispute with Berengarius. Moreover, it is his work which seems to have come down in later theological thought.⁴⁰ This can be explained at least in part by the circumstances of his position, and by the fact that Berengarius' work was not only condemned but also destroyed. It will therefore be of interest to investigate in some detail Lanfranc's notions on the points at issue between himself and Berengarius. These include the notion of sacrament and its relation to the reality signified; the concept of real presence; the understanding of the change effected by consecration; and the significance of body in connection with sacramental presence.

Sacrament - Reality Signified (Res)

Lanfranc claimed that the sacrifice of the Church is not only sacrament, or only body of Christ, but both. It is the visible species of the elements, and the invisible flesh and blood of Christ; it is

⁴⁰Van den Eynde, Antonianum 24 (1949), p. 194: "L'imitation et l'utilisation de l'ouvrage de Lanfranc, dues au revirement qui se produit à ce moment dans la controverse sur l'Eucharistie, a certainement été une des causes principales de la diffusion de ces formules augustinienes."

sacrament (sacramentum) and the reality signified (res).⁴¹ It is truly the flesh of Christ which is eaten on earth, and his blood which is drunk; yet he remains whole and living in heaven at the right hand of the Father.⁴²

As we have seen, Lanfranc accepted the Augustinian definition of a sacrament as a sacred sign which calls to mind something beyond what is actually seen.⁴³ Yet he did not accept this as either the totality of Augustine's thought, or as a complete definition of sacrament. For one thing, there must be the quality of likeness to the thing which is

⁴¹PL 150, 421C: "Hoc est namque quod dicimus, hoc modis omnibus contra te ac sequaces tuos approbare contendimus, sacrificium scilicet Ecclesiae duobus confici, duobus constare, visibili elementorum specie, et invisibili Domini Jesu Christi carne et sanguine, sacramento et re sacramenti; quae res (ut verbis tuis utar) est corpus Christi, sicut Christi persona, te quoque auctore, constat et conficitur Deo et homine, cum ipse Christus sit verus Deus, et verus homo, quia omnis res illarum rerum naturam et veritatem in se continet ex quibus conficitur. Conficitur autem te etiam teste, sacrificium Ecclesiae sacramento et re sacramenti, id est corpore Christi. Est igitur sacramentum et res sacramenti, id est, corpus Christi." Whether these lines originate with Lanfranc or elsewhere, they are found in twelfth-century compilations of texts and come to be quoted as Augustinian. Alger quotes them as the words of Augustine found in Prosper (PL 180, 754). They are often used to support a belief in two distinct natures in the Eucharist, just as in the Incarnation. Cf. C. Gore, Dissertations, London, 1895, p. 275. There is no text in Augustine to support this interpretation. Cf. Battifol, Etudes, p. 433-444. Lanfranc is here defending the belief of the Church in both symbol and reality, sacramentum and res, against the accusation of Berengarius that he holds no symbolism in the Eucharist. Cf. Amann, DTC, 8-1, 2566.

⁴²PL 150, 421D: "Sed, sicut dicit Andreas apostolus, cum vere in terris carnes ejus sint comestae et vera sanguis ejus sit bibitus, ipse tamen usque in tempora restitutionis omnium in coelestibus ad dexteram Patris integer perseverat et vivus." Lanfranc is here quoting a celebrated and often cited (Ivo of Chartres, Bernard, Thomas, Billot), sixth century text, Passio sancti Andree apostoli. It is supposed to be an epistle of the presbyters at the time of the martyrdom of the apostle Andrew. Cf. Battifol, Etudes, p. 33.

PL 150, 422B: "Sic nempe in terris immolatum Christum manducamus et bibimus, ut in coelestibus ad dexteram Patris integer semper existat et vivus."

⁴³PL 150, 422C: "Et nos sacramentum, de quo agimus, sacrum esse signum credimus, et credendum suademus. Quo signo, praeter speciem quae se oculis intuentium ingerit, longe aliud valdeque diversum in cogitationem salubriter intelligentium venit."

signified.⁴⁴ Thus, the breaking of the host and the pouring of the blood from the chalice designate the immolation of the body on the cross. This meaning must enter into the use of the word sacramentum, which can also be used of an oath, or of any sacred thing. Sacramentum, as used in this context, is more than that. It is a visible sign, the species of bread and wine, in which invisible reality is honored, the reality of the flesh and blood of Christ.⁴⁵

Real Presence

The statements to which Berengarius returned again and again, were those in which Lanfranc not only made a sacrament invisible, but also turned what is the reality signified (res) into a further sacrament.⁴⁶ Lanfranc clearly stated that the sacrament of the body of Christ is his

⁴⁴PL 150, 423A: "Sacramenta enim illarum rerum quarum sacramenta sunt semper similitudinem gerunt, sicut in sacramento, de quo haec quaestio ventilatur, dum frangitur hostia, dum sanguis de calice in ora fidelium funditur, quid aliud quam Domini corporis in cruce immolatio ejusque sanguinis de latere effusio designatur?" Cf. Amann, DTC, 8-1, 2566: Lanfranc holds that there is a symbolic aspect in sacrament but this aspect is not the whole of the sacrament.

⁴⁵PL 150, 423C: "Nos etenim in specie panis et vini, quam videmus, res invisibiles, id est Christi carnem et sanguinem, honoramus."

⁴⁶This is probably the major point of difference between Lanfranc and Berengarius. Lanfranc seems to be moving toward an understanding of sacraments which was further clarified in the twelfth century. He uses only the two terms sacramentum and res, but he sees the reality on three levels: (1) the visible sign (sacramentum) which signifies (2) the flesh of Christ (res); this flesh-in-sign (sacramentum) as signifying (3) the body of Christ localized in heaven (res). Berengarius is still dealing with two terms and two levels: (1) the visible sign (sacramentum) of (2) the reality of the body of Christ (res), which in its own proper appearances is localized in heaven. Both are attempting to explain the reality of the presence of a body which is localized in heaven.

flesh; that flesh is the sacrament of flesh, and blood of blood.⁴⁷ The invisible, spiritual flesh and blood signify the visible, palpable body of Christ.⁴⁸ Thus, no movement of the body from heaven is necessary, since this same flesh and blood become the reality which is received, and the sacrament of the reality in heaven.⁴⁹ According to Lanfranc, Augustine spoke similarly of the appearance of Christ to the two disciples at Emmaus as signifying his coming ascension. In that event, Christ as he appeared was the sacrament of Christ as he is in glory.⁵⁰

⁴⁷PL 150, 423D: "Sacramentum corporis Christi, quantum ad id spectat quod in cruce immolatus est ipse Dominus Christus, caro ejus est, quam forma panis opertam, in sacramento accipimus, et sanguis ejus, quem sub vini specie ac sapore potamus. Caro, videlicet carnis, et sanguis sacramentum est sanguinis." Cf. Haring, MedSt 10 (1948), p. 112: Lanfranc's use of the word in a wider sense turned out to be a momentous decision in the history of sacraments. Lanfranc refused to accept Berengarius' limitation of sacramentum to the visible aspect only.

⁴⁸PL 150, 424A: "Carne et sanguine, utroque invisibili, intelligibili, spirituali, significatur Redemptoris corpus visibile, palpabile, manifestum plenum gratia omnium virtutum et divina majestate." Macdonald, Berengar, p. 297: mistranslates this passage and gives a totally different meaning to it, again accusing Lanfranc of contradiction: "In the invisible, noumenal, and spiritual flesh and blood the body of the Redeemer is signified visibly, palpably, clearly." Lanfranc is actually designating the res sacramenti, the invisible flesh of Christ, as in turn the sacramentum of the glorified body which exists visible and palpable in heaven. Visibile, palpabile, and plenum are neuter nominatives modifying corpus; they are not adverbs modifying significatur.

⁴⁹PL 150, 424B: "Nec juste quisquam movebitur, si eadem caro, idemque sanguis sui ipsorum sacramenta existant secundum aliud atque aliud accepta, cum ipse Dominus Jesus, post resurrectionem suam, sui ipsius diversa temporum ratione typum gesserit et figuram."

⁵⁰PL 150, 424C: "Apparens enim duobus discipulis, locutusque eis, quantum satis esse judicavit, dum finxit se longius ire (Luc xxiv, 13-28), sicut beatus Augustinus dicit, significavit se post paucos dies in coelum ascensurum esse. Quod iter longe remotum est a communi hominum vita, quae ipsis et duobus discipulis evidentissime, figurata. Christus ergo Christi est sacramentum." This text is wrongly attributed to Augustine. Cf. de Ghellinck, Melanges, p. 89.

Lanfranc himself said that in the sacrament of the Eucharist the flesh of the Lord (res and sacramentum) is daily immolated, divided and eaten; true flesh, flesh from the Virgin, the whole Christ is eaten.⁵¹ Both physical and spiritual eating is required; both are fruitful. A merely physical eating is not effective for the removal of sin, but increases it. A merely spiritual eating cannot and ought not be. Yet, the body is not to be equated with Christ, any more than a man is called merely body, for what is said of a part cannot always be said of the whole.⁵²

⁵¹PL 150, 425C: "In sacramento tamen quod in hujus rei memoriam frequentat Ecclesia, caro Domini quotidie immolatur, dividitur, comeditur, et sanguis ejus de calice fidelium ore-potatur. Utraque vera, utraque de Virgine sumpta. Sumitur quidem caro per se, et sanguis per se non sine certi mysterii ratione. Quamvis alio locutionis modo totus Christus manducari dicatur et credatur, scilicet cum vita aeterna, quae ipse est, spirituali desiderio appetitur, cum recordatio mandatorum ejus super mel et favum dulcior in mente habetur, cum fraterna charitas, cujus signum hoc sacramentum gestat, pro Christi amore diligitur, cum dulciter atque salubriter in memoria reconditur quod pro salute hominum contumeliis sit affectus, cruce suspensus, clavis affixus, lancea vulneratus." In this eating of the body, Macdonald interprets Lanfranc to admit the presence of bread: "he is compelled to admit that the material bread is actually received in the Eucharist, and nourishes the body, just as the spiritual and invisible body of Christ nourishes the soul." Berengar, p. 294. In support of this, he quotes PL 150, 438D, where Lanfranc is actually supporting the use of the name "bread" for the eucharistic body, since it (body) fulfills the same function as bread, thus establishing the similitude by which the name can be validly applied.

⁵²PL 150, 425D-426A: "Utraque comestio necessaria, utraque fructuosa. . . . Nam prior si desit, posterior non solum peccata non purgat, sed etiam auget, et praesumptores judicat. . . . Porro posterior sine priore esse non potest aut non debet. . . . Frustra ergo infers et dicis: 'Si semel passus est Christus in semetipso, semel etiam in corpore suo, eo quod corpus suum nullo modo separari potest a seipso.' Quod non praecedit. Multa quippe sunt in rebus, quae rerum partibus convenire non possunt."

Change

How the change of visible bread and wine into invisible flesh and blood actually takes place remained a mystery as far as Lanfranc was concerned.⁵³ A substantial change takes place; the bread and wine placed on the altar are incomprehensibly and ineffably changed into the substance of flesh and blood.⁵⁴ It is a change of essence;⁵⁵ the bread and wine are essentially changed in nature.⁵⁶ And who could say that a thing is changed and yet remains unchanged?⁵⁷ This essential change in nature cannot be explained by arguments or reasonings; not everything is subject to the senses. It is believed by faith as an act of divine power.⁵⁸ Thus, faith faces and accepts the reality of the body of Christ remaining incorrupt in

⁵³PL 150, 421D: "Mysterium fidei credi salubriter potest, vestigari utiliter non potest." Cf. supra n. 39.

⁵⁴PL 150, 419A: "Panem et vinum ad sacrandum proponi in altare, sed, inter sacrandum, incomprehensibiliter et ineffabiliter in substantiam carnis et sanguinis commutari." Macdonald, *Berengar*, p. 296: accuses Lanfranc of contradicting himself by holding that the change is supersubstantial (419A), and also a material change (415B). A look at the texts clears Lanfranc of the charge. In 419A, "supersubstantialem" refers to the bread from heaven, the glorified body, present according to Lanfranc by means of the invisible flesh hidden under the visible species. He elsewhere explains how it is validly called "bread", and speaks clearly in this text of the spiritual effects produced. In the other text, 415B, Lanfranc makes no statement about change; he merely states what is taken to be Berengarius' position. Lanfranc's philosophical knowledge would hardly permit him to make the distinction that Macdonald takes, yet it must be admitted that a change of essence necessarily changes the matter, even if the externals should remain.

⁵⁵PL 150, 430C: "converti in essentiam Dominici corporis."

⁵⁶PL 150, 427A: "utriusque essentialiter mutata natura."

⁵⁷PL 150, 419D: "Quis enim compos sui credat rem aliquam converti in aliam, nec tamen in ea parte desinere esse quod erat?"

⁵⁸PL 150, 427A: "Quoniam modo panis efficiatur caro vinumque convertatur in sanguinem, utriusque essentialiter mutata natura, justus, qui ex fide vivit, scrutari argumentis et concipere ratione non quaerit. . . . Non est enim tibi necessarium ea quae abscondita sunt videre oculis tuis. Divina tamen potentia mirabiliter operante fieri posse concedit."

heaven, and still truly eaten on earth.⁵⁹

It is the word of God which is operative in this action.⁶⁰ The same word whose power brought all things out of nothing works in the consecration to bring the body of Christ out of the bread. Now the word of Christ acts to convert the world.⁶¹

Body

What is this body which is present in the eucharistic sacrament? According to Lanfranc, the body of the Lord, truly incorruptible, is in heaven until the day of judgment and cannot be called down.⁶² Yet this same body is present on earth in the sacrament of the invisible flesh hidden under the sacrament of the visible species of bread.⁶³ It is the same body and not the same: the same in essence; not the same in species. This is fitting in order that we may have faith, that we may believe what

⁵⁹PL 150, 427B: "Quod vero incorruptionem Dominici corporis, et quod coelo usque in diem iudicii devocari non possit: fidei nostrae quae ipsum vere a fidelibus suis manducari credimus, quasi causam impossibilitatis opponis, profecto fidem nostram aut non intelligis, aut intellectam male exponendo ad tuam ipsius perniciem depravare contendis. Sic enim credimus vere salubriterque manducari in terris a digne percipientibus Dominum Jesum Christum, ut certissime teneamus existere illum in coelestibus incontaminatum, incorruptum, illaesum."

⁶⁰PL 150, 431C: "Nam sacramentum istud quod accipis, Christi sermone conficitur."

⁶¹PL 150, 431C: "Sermo ergo Christi qui potuit ex nihilo facere quod non erat, non potest ea quae sunt in id mutare quod non erant? Non enim minus est novas rebus dare quam mutare naturas."

⁶²PL 150, 427C: "Quod vero incorruptionem Dominici corporis, et quod coelo usque in diem iudicii devocari non possit."

⁶³PL 150, 423D: "Sacramentum corporis Christi, . . . caro ejus est, quam forma panis operam, in sacramento accipimus, et sanguis ejus, quem sub vini specie ac sapore potamus."

we do not see by the bodily senses.⁶⁴

Lanfranc summed up his belief in an admirable profession of faith:

We believe, therefore, that the earthly substances, which are divinely sanctified on the Lord's table through a priestly mystery, ineffably, incomprehensibly, wonderfully, under the working of supernatural power, are converted into the essence of the Lord's body, while the species of the things themselves and certain other qualities are preserved, so that those looking on may not be horrified at crude and bloody sights and so that the believing faithful might experience greater rewards. Nevertheless the Lord's body itself exists in the heavens at the right hand of the Father, immortal, inviolate, whole, unaffected, unharmed, so that it may be said truly to assume both the very body which was taken from the Virgin, and yet not the very one. The very body indeed in respect to the essence and propriety of the true nature and virtue; not the very body however, if you will look at the species of bread and wine, and the other things referred to before. The Church which, scattered throughout the whole earth is called catholic, has held this belief from early times and holds it now.⁶⁵

⁶⁴PL 150, 430C: "ut vere dici possit, et ipsum corpus quod de Virgine sumptum sumere, et tamen non ipsum. Ipsum quidem, quantum ad essentiam veraeque naturae proprietatem atque virtutem; non ipsum autem, si species panis viniue speciem, caeteraque superius comprehensa." Macdonald, Berengar, p. 295: sees this as a breakdown of Lanfranc's realism. Yet he does not take note of Lanfranc's distinction of same and not the same. Lanfranc is clearly holding for a real presence of the body of Christ, but in the sacramental form which is what is eaten: "Neque enim eo quo ipsi putabant modo credimus quod visibile Christi corpus comedamus, aut sanguinem quem fusuri et oculis suis conspecturi erant persequentes bibamus. Sed potius id credimus quod non videmus, ut valeat esse fides, quae non potest esse, si res quae creduntur corporalibus sensibus constiterit subiacere." 434A.

⁶⁵PL 150, 430C: "Credimus igitur terrenas substantias, quae in mensa Dominica, per sacerdotale mysterium, divinitus sanctificantur, ineffabiliter, incomprehensibiliter, mirabiliter, operante superna potentia, converti in essentiam Dominici corporis, reservatis ipsarum rerum speciebus, et quibusdam aliis qualitatibus, ne percipientes cruda et cruenta, horrerent, et ut credentes fidei praemia ampliora perciperent, ipso tamen Dominico corpore existente in coelestibus ad dexteram Patris, immortalis, inviolato, integro, incontaminato, illaeso: ut vera dici possit, et ipsum corpus quod de Virgine sumptum sumere, et tamen non ipsum. Ipsum quidem, quantum ad essentiam veraeque naturae proprietatem atque virtutem; non ipsum autem, si species panis viniue speciem, caeteraque superius comprehensa; hanc fidem tenuit a priscis temporibus, et nunc tenet Ecclesia, quae per totum diffusa orbem catholica nominatur."

Using the words of Augustine, Lanfranc identified this Church diffused throughout the whole world as the body of Christ on earth.⁶⁶

Lanfranc concludes his refutation of Berengarius' teaching: What you believe concerning the body of Christ is therefore false.⁶⁷

Conclusions

Lanfranc's stated purpose in writing the De corpore et sanguine Domini was to refute the errors of Berengarius and to affirm the true teaching of the Church. There is no attempt to present a scholarly treatise on the Eucharist, nor is any original contribution to be found in this work. Lanfranc was drawn into the controversy by circumstance, and his role was later given greater significance than it deserved. As the abbot of Bec, the archbishop of Canterbury, and the defender of orthodoxy, Lanfranc was widely quoted in the succeeding centuries. His work became one of the primary channels for diffusion of the augustinian formulas. In fact, his own statements were even attributed to Augustine, giving them immense value in a tradition-conscious atmosphere, and posing unnecessary problems for eucharistic scholars.

Eucharistic faith, for Lanfranc, is based on the authority of God as expressed in the teaching of the Church and the testimony of the Fathers. He is primarily a witness of tradition, an example of the man who accepts without question or investigation the statements of authority. He works from sound principles of divine truth, the common faith of the Church, and the collective evidence of the Fathers. To him, Berengarius flaunts

⁶⁶PL 150, 442B; "Augustinus, in secunda psalmerum expositionis parte (enarr. in psal. LVI): 'Corpus est autem Ecclesia, non ista, aut illa, sed toto orbe diffusa.'"

⁶⁷PL 150, 442D: "Falsum est igitur quod de corpore Christi a te creditur et astruitur."

every type of authority and, with insidious pride, places himself above every accepted criterion of truth. Lanfranc's basic accusation against Berengarius deals with authority; the refusal to accept the belief of Humbert, of the popes, of bishops assembled in council, of the common faith. Allied to this is the charge of denying the testimony of the Fathers and of scholars such as Paschasius. Lanfranc accuses Berengarius of outright distortion of Ambrose's theory of change and of Augustine's teaching on sacraments.

It is not that Lanfranc denies the validity of dialectical argument. As a scholar of the times, he rather enjoys it. But he does object to any possibility that argumentation or human wisdom can ever contradict the faith as expressed by the Church. The point is, as far as he is concerned, that Berengarius is avoiding the issue of doctrine by engaging in logical argumentation and the manipulation of words. In fact, when Lanfranc cannot handle the argument, he himself retreats to authority.

In eucharistic doctrine, Lanfranc disagreed with Berengarius in the concept of sacrament, in the meaning of body, in the manner of bodily presence, and in the type of change which takes place.

For Lanfranc, the Eucharist exists both as sacrament and as body. He, in line with the tradition from Augustine through Isidore, adopts a wider use of the term sacramentum, to include any sacred sign which points to something beyond itself. In the eucharistic context this sign is actually a visible reality in which an invisible reality is honored. In the visible species (sacramentum) exists the invisible reality of the flesh of Christ (res), which in turn is the sign (sacramentum) of the palpable body in heaven (res). In relation to the visible species, the invisible flesh of Christ is res; in relation to the palpable body, the same invisible

flesh is sacramentum. Berengarius will passionately contest such a notion of sacramentum.

There is no doubt that, for Lanfranc, the risen body of Christ is in heaven, visible, palpable, just as it was on earth.⁶⁸ But it is also incorruptible and cannot return to earth until the end of time. Yet the sacrament really is the flesh of Christ; an invisible, spiritual flesh which is a sign of the body. It is the flesh which is eaten, physically and spiritually. The eucharistic body is identified with the historical body although its manner of being is different. The body in each case is the same, but manifested differently. Lanfranc is left with an unresolved problem in his eucharistic belief. A body which is located in heaven, indivisible and incorruptible, is said to be actually present on the altar. The flesh of Christ is handled and eaten in the sacrament. To eat the consecrated bread is to eat the flesh of Christ. This sacrament is the body of Christ.

How this can be possible, how it actually comes to be, is a question Lanfranc leaves to authority. That a change takes place cannot be denied. It is a substantial change; the bread is essentially changed in nature.⁶⁹ The fact remains a mystery which logic and words cannot explain. Faith recognizes it as an act of divine power.

Lanfranc thus takes his stand in the centuries of dispute; the eucharistic body is identical with the body born of the Virgin, this identity

⁶⁸It is difficult to see Amann's distinction (DTC, 8-1, 2566) between the belief of Lanfranc and that of Berengarius. He says the two agree on the existence of two elements, the visible and the invisible, sacramentum and res. But for Berengar, the reality is absent, it is in heaven. While for Lanfranc, the visible elements contain the invisible flesh of Christ. According to the text, Lanfranc is just as convinced that the sensible reality, the glorified body of Christ, is in heaven.

⁶⁹The phrases he uses for change leave no doubt as to the substantial change that is accepted: "commutari secundum interiorem essentiam"; "in pristinis essentiis"; "essentialiter." Cf. Southern, Studies, p. 40.

being hidden under different modalities of being.⁷⁰ It is not correct to accuse Lanfranc, as Berengarius does, of believing that the flesh of Christ is visibly on the altar; the sacrament is visible, but the sacrament is the flesh of Christ. Lanfranc accepts on faith the possibility of a real though invisible flesh, as well as the possibility of the visible elements of bread without bread.

Berengarius, and those who continue to probe the question, will seek for a clearer understanding and more precise expression of this relationship of sign to reality which is a fact of faith.

⁷⁰Geiselmann, Die Eucharistielehre, pp. 369-370: sees Lanfranc as the first to consider the real presence as based on a principle of being rather than a principle of action: "Lanfrank ist demnach der erste auf Seiten der Metaboliker, der die Vergegenwärtigung der sakramentalen Realität nicht bloss als Setzung eines neuen Wirkprinzips, sondern eines neuen Seinsprinzips fasst, wobei die zurückbleibenden Eigenschaften deutlich nicht als subjektiver Empfindungswert, sondern als objektiver Seinsmodus der eucharistischen Realitäten beurteilt werden."

PART II

THE RESPONSE OF BERENGARIUS AS SEEN IN THE

DE SACRA COENA

CHAPTER IV

THE METHOD OF BERENGARIUS IN DE SACRA COENA

It is a difficult task to analyze the content of the De Sacra Coena: it is impossible to discover a theological method therein. Berengarius had no intention of writing a eucharistic treatise. He was passionately engaged in answering the charges which Lanfranc brought against him in the De corpore et sanguine Domini. The end result, far from being a systematic work, is a confused and endlessly repetitious refutation of Lanfranc's statements.¹ The appeal to authority draws in countless quotations from Ambrose, Augustine, and other Fathers. It is often difficult to determine the source of a statement and to know whether or not Berengarius accepts it.

The method of procedure which Berengarius followed was to quote the accusations of Lanfranc and to deny them from logic, from tradition, from Scripture, from common sense--from any source, but always with vehemence.² The main conclusion of the work might well be that Lanfranc was a madman.³

¹"Considered entirely apart from the doctrine which it presents, the De Sacra Coena is a wretched book, extremely lengthy and prolix, written in abominable Latin without any semblance of order or consecutive development, a solid block of 290 octavo pages in the Fischer edition of 1834, without a single heading, often trailing along for pages on end without so much as a paragraph division, and worst of all, made entirely tedious by the constant repetition of its themes--one often feels he is reading over and over again the same page." Sheedy, p. 36.

²DSC, 46, p. 160: "videri potuit non dicam Lanfranno multae eruditionis viro sed idiotae."

³DSC, 42, p. 138: "Stupenda in tua eruditione vecordia."

Since Lanfranc accused Berengarius in the three areas of authority, the use of texts, and the validity of logical argumentation, these will be the points on which he must be heard. Some evaluation can be made of his method in the light of his attitude toward the roles of faith and reason in the understanding of doctrine. A brief study of his use of language will provide the basis for a more meaningful investigation of his eucharistic thought.

Authority

Lanfranc had accused Berengarius of rejecting the authority of the Church by refusing to accept the eucharistic faith as expressed by a cardinal, Humbert; by the popes; by the bishops assembled in council; and by the common belief of the faithful. Berengarius answers each charge, showing that it is not the Church, nor its authority, nor the ecclesiastical office that he spurns. Rather, he rejects falsity, whether it be false expression of the faith, or false use of power.

Humbert bears the full brunt of Berengarius' wrath at being forced to profess belief in an absolute untruth.⁴ Although he held the office of cardinal of the Church and was therefore a servant of God, Berengarius found Humbert to be not a servant of God but a member of the anti-Christ.⁵ He is at one and the same time an enemy of truth since he holds the body of Christ to be corruptible, and an assertor of truth since he says that the consecrated bread of the altar is the body of Christ.⁶ Berengarius was

⁴DSC, 1, p. 1: "quia Humbertus auctor scripti erronei fuit."

⁵DSC, 4, p. 4: "non dei servum sed antichristi membrum."

⁶DSC, 4, p. 4: "inimicum veritatis, quia Christi corpus adhuc corruptibile esse constituit. . . . assertorem veritatis, quia dicit corpus Christi esse sacrosanctum panem altaris."

attacking Humbert not as a cardinal, not as a representative of the faith of the Church, but as a man who taught not humbly but arrogantly.⁷ Berengarius felt that if Humbert really had any Christian humility, he would not have condemned him as a heretic without a hearing.⁸ In this instance, Humbert had not acted as a member of the Church.⁹ It is the falseness of the man and of his doctrine which Berengarius rejects.

With the popes, it is again the individual, not the authority of the office, which is spurned. In speaking of Pope Leo, Berengarius considers him as not at all holy, not even a worthy man. He regards Leo's action of declaring him a heretic as foolish as other things he was known to have done.¹⁰ Not only had Leo acted against the truth in condemning Berengarius; he had betrayed his own office. Berengarius saw it as an act of sacrilege performed in haste, for it is against both human and divine law

⁷DSC, 5, p. 6: "non humiliter sed superbissime docuit, quia ad praeferendum se mihi contra ipsam veritatem corruptibile adhuc esse Christi corpus dicere non exhorruit."

⁸DSC, 5, p. 6: "Si humilitas in illo christiana fuisset, non me inauditum quasi hereticum condemnasset."

⁹DSC, 5, p. 6: "Si membrum aecclesiae fuisset revera, me audiens, si veritatis invenisset inimicum, ad revincendum errorem meum, mecum sub congruis iudiciis, non cum gladiis et fustibus sed christiana mansuetudine constitisset."

¹⁰DSC, 6, pp. 6-7: "Videris tu, inquit ego, ne papam illum tibi sanctum fecerit calumpnia tua, secundum quod Oratium attendisse superius posui, secundum quod beatus Augustinus scribit Manicheos solere dicere, quod ad idem valeret ad quod si dicerent quod volumus sanctum est. Ego papam minime sanctum minime Leonem de tribu Juda et ut ulterius aliquid audeam secundum illum qui dixit: 'vos ex diabolo patre estis', minime virum probum expertus sum, de quo omnibus qui legerint satisfactum est in eo quod de Leone illo ne verum putaretur quod me hereticum dicebat, cum desiperet etiam circa alia, tota ego urgente necessitate conscripsi."

to condemn a man unheard.¹¹ To Berengarius, Leo was a man of diplomacy rather than veracity, as he illustrated in recounting two incidents at the time of the synod of Vercelli. The bishop of Vercelli was involved in an adulterous relationship with the wife of a noble. Vainly the noble tried to get a papal hearing of his grievance. Leo even accepted the hospitality of the bishop while the noble's appeals were never heard.¹²

Also at Vercelli, pressure was brought upon Leo concerning the practice of reordaining simonist bishops. Leo admitted his error and begged the prayers of the assembly. But when he had returned to Rome and was questioned by those who favored reordination, he returned to error and reordained several bishops.¹³

Berengarius reports these incidents only to show that if Lanfranc calls such a man holy, he cannot be counted on to give an unbiased account

¹¹DSC, 7, p. 8: "Quod promulgatam dicis in me dampnationis sententiam, sacrilegae sancto illi tuo Leoni notam praecipitationis affigis. Injustum enim esse praescribunt tam humana jura quam divina inauditum aliquem condemnari, contra quod spiritus sanctus."

¹²DSC, 8, p. 11: "Apostolicus apud adulterum Vercellensem illum hospitium accepit, regalibus adulteri sumptibus per dies non paucos exceptus est, eadem domo eodem non dubitans participare convivio, cum interim papiensis pro illata sibi a nepote injuria, foris, intus, in ecclesia, in consessibus omnia temptaret, omnibus si forte apud apostolicum pro tanto adulterio obtinerent molestus esse non desisteret. Nichil effecit, etiam intacta ejus causa re mansit."

¹³DSC, 8, p. 11: "In errorem rediit atque post ad voluntatem eorum, qui Romae fuerunt, maxime Humberti illius tui, reordinavit episcopum Redonensem Magnum nomine, episcopum Lemouicensem Iterium cognomento Capreolum, abbatem quoque Rodonensem nomine Pireneum, quos pro eo nominatim inserui, quia noti mihi erant et mecum de eo, quod Romae gestum fuit ipsi egerant, ne quis me putet de opinione, non de rei veritate scripsisse."

of the truth.¹⁴

Although he had no respect for the individual who held the office,¹⁵ Berengarius held the papacy itself in esteem. It was a reverence shown in action. Despite his opinion of Leo, Berengarius was ready to go to Rome because of his regard for the papal office.¹⁶ He also recognized the authority of Henry as king of France and abbot of St. Martin by asking his permission to make the journey. Again, the man in authority did not treat Berengarius well, but instead had him taken into custody.¹⁷ The reaction of Leo was not assistance, but condemnation. He did not show concern for

¹⁴DSC, 8, p. 11: "nec de papa illo Leone maledicendi voto haec refero, . . . sed ut probabilius fiat eis qui haec forte legerint, quod tanti facit illum papam scriptum tuum, non de rei veritate sed de mea tibi calumpnia processisse." Even in the historical account of the events of the controversy, Berengarius is generally considered a more reliable witness than Lanfranc. "Lanfranc n'était pas incapable de fraude, on le sait, et son récit n'est pas vraisemblance en tout point." Cappuyns, DHGE, 389. "confirms the general trustworthiness of Berengar's account of the controversy. It is to be preferred to that of Lanfranc. If the latter was an eye-witness at Vercelli, Berengar obtained his information from a clerk who was present." Macdonald, Berengar, p. 83, n. 2. "Mais la netteté, la précision et l'abondance des détails fournis par l'accuse lui-même ne laissent pas de doute sur l'exactitude des faits qu'il rapporte, et, au point de vue historique, son témoignage l'emporte sur celui de Lanfranc." Heurtevent, p. 146.

¹⁵DSC, 8, p. 11: "maxima nichilominus papae illi indignatio propter nimiam a me et a christiana et apostolica paternitate aversionem suam." The opinion is too strong and not borne out by the text which holds that "Berengar had nothing but contempt for the magisterium." Sheedy, p. 50.

¹⁶DSC, 8, pp. 11-12: "Pervenerat enim ad me praecepisse Leonem illum, ut ego Vercellensi illi conventui, in quo tamen nullam papae debebam oboedientiam, non deessem; dissuaserant secundum aecclesiastica jura, secundum quae nullus extra provinciam ad iudicium ire cogendus est, personae aecclesiasticae, dissuaserant amici; ego ob reverentiam pontificatus Romani multo Romam iter labore susceperam." Again, it does not seem true to say that "not only towards the Councils but also towards the Holy See itself was Berengar lacking both in respect and obedience." Sheedy, p. 51.

¹⁷DSC, 8, p. 12: "me carcerandum, hac rebus omnibus expoliandum . cuidam dedit."

the dignity of the apostolic office, whose authority was challenged in preventing Berengarius from responding to the papal summons.¹⁸ To Berengarius, these men did not act in truth, but in falseness.

Succeeding popes did not deal any more kindly with Berengarius. Neither Pope Victor nor his legates ever gave him a chance to present his views.¹⁹ And Pope Nicholas left the whole matter in the hands of Humbert.²⁰ There was no serious search for truth. Only Hildebrand truly investigated the charge of heresy.²¹ Berengarius was heard by him and swore an oath to his faith: "Bread and wine after consecration are the body and blood of Christ."²² He was ready to accompany Hildebrand to Rome to settle the charges against him,²³ when Pope Leo died. It would not be until

¹⁸DSC, 8, p. 12: "Hoc Leo ille Vercellis audivit; non apostolica dignitate, non paterna miseratione, non humana motus est compassione, qui, si non michi, apostolicae saltim sedi, ad quam jussus contendebam, dare debuit gloriam, ut si non pro me, saltim pro apostolica dignitate quantus posset exurgeret in eum, qui me ad se intendentem carcere clauserat, rebus expoliabat, pro me in eum gladium christianae animadversionis exsereret; hereticum me potius voce sacrilega, non enim miseratione divina veridica. . . in conventu illo Vercellensi pronunciavit."

¹⁹DSC, 11, p. 16: "Numquam papa Victor per se vel per legatos mecum egit de mensa dominica, numquam in eo mihi defendendi quae afferrem optionem fecit."

²⁰DSC, 16, p. 29: "solus Humbertus ille, inconvento et inaudito me, sine mora et lima diligentioris secundum scripturas considerationis quod voluit scripsit, nimiaque levitate Nicholas ille, de cujus ineruditione et morum indignitate facile mihi erat non insufficienter scribere, . . . quod dixerat Humbertus approbavit, approbaverunt et plurimi."

²¹DSC, 11, p. 17: "veritatis perspicuitate cognita."

²²DSC, 11, p. 18: "Panis atque vinum altaris post consecrationem sunt corpus Christi et sanguis."

²³DSC, 11, p. 18: "ad satisfaciendum de mensa dominica, de eminentia rationis, de immunitate auctoritatis expectarem, secundum quod convenerat cum illo mihi."

the reign of Hildebrand as Gregory VII that the Berengarian affair would be resolved.²⁴

Lanfranc had charged that Berengarius rejected the faith of the Church as expressed by the bishops assembled in council. Berengarius replies that if what the bishops declare is not true, it is not the faith of the Church.²⁵ He brings up the historical fact of the error of African bishops regarding the rebaptism of heretics; that at the councils of Agripinus and of Cyprian those who returned to the Church were baptized again.²⁶ Even though the number of bishops be great and their learning impressive, they are not empowered to proclaim falsehood as the faith of the Church.²⁷ Certainly, at the time of the Arian heresy, the truth had very few adherents. In fact, only Rome and four other cities had Catholic bishops. Yet, the

²⁴Victor II and Stephen IX paid little attention to the controversy. Alexander II was benevolent to Berengarius, but did not take the matter in hand. When Hildebrand became Gregory VII, he summoned Berengarius to Rome, was still friendly and understanding with him. At a synod in 1078, Berengarius made a profession of faith with which Gregory was quite satisfied. By 1079, some of the bishops had amended the profession to include the idea of substantial conversion. Berengarius agreed to the new formula provided he could apply his own meaning to it. At this point, Gregory became adamant, insisting that he pronounce the formula and mean it as he and the bishops understood it. Berengarius once again submitted out of fear, was forbidden to speak publicly about the Eucharist, and retired. Cf. Cappuyns, DHGE, 394.

²⁵DSC, 15, p. 26: "qui veritatis non ignari et ipsi discipuli Jesu revera soli sinodus erant dicendi."

²⁶DSC, 8, 10: "adhuc rebaptizaret Affricana aecclesia, postquam in Agripini prius, deinde in beati Cipriani conciliis, ut rebaptizarentur qui redibant ad ecclesiam, ab omnibus maxime episcopis, maxime eruditis firmatum est, omnibus placuit."

²⁷DSC, 9, p. 13: "irritum nunc esse universae aecclesiae ut rebaptizetur quis, quod fieri debere, qui de tam diversis mundi partibus convenerunt longe eruditiores, longe religiosiores quam nostra tempora episcopos habeant, in tot conciliis tempore Agripini Cartaginensis episcopi, tempore beati Cipriani, sententiam dederunt atque rebaptizandi in Affrica non modico tempore consuetudinem fecerunt."

bishop of Rome was not a heretic although such large numbers considered him so.²⁸ Groups of bishops, even large numbers of bishops, have been known to favor what proved to be heresy. The gathering at Vercelli was not representative of the universal Church but of one region and language.²⁹ They did not examine the teaching in question, for the book of John Scotus (Ratramnus) was barely looked at, only a small passage being read before the condemnation.³⁰ The opinion of Berengarius on the matter of eucharistic presence could not have been investigated since he had formed no opinion at that time.³¹ No serious attempt was made to ascertain the truth, and ecclesiastical law was violated in condemning a man without warning or hearing. To Berengarius, such conduct was not true and was therefore not an act of the Church.³²

The same arguments were held by Berengarius against accepting the common belief of the people as the faith of the Church. A belief in false doctrine cannot come from the Church.³³ In both previous questions

²⁸DSC, 12, p. 20: "nec te latet aliquando heresim in tantum invaluisse Arrianam, ut sola Roma Liberium solae quattuor urbes cismarinae catholicos haberent episcopos."

²⁹DSC, 9, p. 13: "de diversis mundi partibus, . . . de ejusdem regionis et linguae."

³⁰DSC, 9, p. 12: "nulla . . . alia diligentia dampnatum, quam ut semel locus quidam illius audiretur et ita dampnaretur."

³¹DSC, 9, p. 13: "dico de rei veritate et testimonio conscientiae meae, nullum eo tempore sententiam meam exposuisse, quia nec mihi eo tempore tanta perspicuitate constabat, quia nondum tanta pro veritate eo tempore perpressus nondum tam diligenti in scripturis consideratione satageram."

³²DSC, 9, p. 13: "nec dubitas ineptorum turbas aecclesiam nominare."

³³DSC, 6, p. 7: "Quod usitatam aecclesiae fidem non dubitas dicere, quasi quae usitatiora ea debeant esse probabiliora, quod quidem revera suo loco constaret, si tu abusum, usum perverse non diceres, jam superius dixi, quae usitatiora sint, secundum abusum dico ea esse ineptiora, jam dixi superius, ineptorum in aecclesia turbas non esse aecclesiam."

of rebaptism and Arianism, great numbers of people mistakenly held to false doctrine. There is no assurance that numbers guarantee truth. It is not truth to maintain the body itself is broken and chewed, not in its sacramental form but in reality.³⁴ Such is not the faith of the Church.³⁵

Berengarius recognized the abuse of authority and of truth on the part of individuals within the Church, but it did not alter his loyalty to the Church.³⁶ He never had any intention of either heresy or schism.³⁷

Use of Texts

Berengarius insists that he has not written anything contrary to the truth concerning the Eucharist, since all that he wrote is to be found in the prophets, the apostles, the words of the Lord himself, and in the writings of the eminent defenders of truth: Augustine, Ambrose, Hilary,

³⁴DSC, 9, p. 14: "ejusdem corporis per manus fractionem, per dentes attricionem et non quod ad sacramentum sed quod ad rem sacramenti pertineat." In the light of textual evidence, it seems strange, uncalled for, and false to make a comparison that says: "Berengar exaggerated the importance of rational speculation, tried to use it to establish the content of the mystery of the Holy Eucharist, and thus disqualified himself from any appreciation of the truth of the Mystery of Faith. His principal adversaries, however, . . . accepted the mystery as revealed by Scripture and tradition." Sheedy, p. x.

³⁵DSC, 25, p. 54: "non debere appellari ecclesie fidem vecordium in ecclesia errorem."

³⁶DSC, 1, p. 1: "Nicholaum illum nulla sacerdotio suo digna eminuisse vigilancia sique mansuetudine christiana actum mecum fuisset a me debuisset, si me ab ecclesia aversum vel ecclesie adversum reputavisset, quod ego in eo numquam adverti."

³⁷DSC, 8, pp. 9-10: "quia nec cogitavi aliquando nec volui deperire ecclesiae unionem fidei et bonae actionis."

Gregory, and many others.³⁸ Throughout his work, he constantly appeals to the authority of Scripture and the Fathers. In fact, Berengarius quotes at such length from the very sources which Lanfranc had cited that it is difficult to know if Berengarius really agrees with the authors, or is merely collecting texts as a refutation of Lanfranc.

Lanfranc had accused Berengarius of misinterpretation of Ambrose's theory of change. Berengarius defends his position so that no one may falsely think that he is misinterpreting the opinion of Ambrose.³⁹ To get a true evaluation of Ambrose's theory, it is necessary to refer to the places where Ambrose clearly shows what kind of conversion he thinks takes place.⁴⁰ Berengarius proceeds to do this in the text. A repeated warning is given to interpret the words of Ambrose according to preceding meanings from the same book.⁴¹ And evidently Berengarius agrees with Ambrose's advice to have recourse to authority when reason fails.⁴²

³⁸DSC, 45, p. 157: "omnia quae de ea scripsi, a propheta, ab apostolo, ab ipso prophetarum et apostolorum domino et invictissimis in ecclesia veritatis assertoribus Augustino, Ambrosio, Hilario, Gregorio, ut ceteros omittam, accepisse, qui et de regeneratione et de refectione fidelium spiritualiter senserunt et ad interiorum utrumque referunt hominem." It hardly seems justified to claim that "he places at the basis of his search for truth the principles and methods of an immature philosophy, the dialectics of the schools." Sheedy, p. 56.

³⁹DSC, 42, p. 140: "quod ut nullus arbitretur perverse me interpretari contra beati Ambrosii sententiam."

⁴⁰DSC, 42, p. 140: "recurrendum est ad ea loca, ubi evidenter beatus manifestat Ambrosius, quo genere conversionis sentiat converti panem et vinum altaris in corpus et sanguinem Christi."

⁴¹DSC, 42, p. 143: "expende beati Ambrosii dicta haec posteriora secundum illius ipsius beati Ambrosii praecedentia de eodem dicta et sensa."

⁴²DSC, 39, p. 119: "Quasi diceret: Si non sufficis, quod dico: panis quem accipis corpus Christi est, ratione comprehendere, cede auctoritati meae, qui tibi denuntio ita esse, per verba quibus propheta confirmat de rerum institutione prima: ipse dixit et facta sunt, ipse mandavit et creata sunt. Attendens in infinitum alia, cede auctoritati, si ad rationem non sufficis."

Berengarius denies the charge of distortion of texts and exhorts all lovers of truth to believe him to be conscientious in his interpretation of Scripture and the Fathers.⁴³ Indeed he accuses Lanfranc of using texts for his own purposes.⁴⁴ Quoting numerous texts from Augustine, Berengarius chides Lanfranc for thinking that the words of Augustine support his own foolishness.⁴⁵ He accuses Lanfranc of approaching the texts of Augustine with malice blinding his heart,⁴⁶ so that he saw in the words of Augustine a proof for his notion of visible flesh. Berengarius interprets the same words to maintain the presence of bread.

Besides constant citations throughout the text, Berengarius devotes the last few chapters of the treatise almost entirely to quotations from Augustine (43; 44), Ambrose (45), Jerome (45), and the liturgical texts (46). References to the reality of the presence of Christ's body abound in these chapters.

The passages from Augustine are most numerous, emphasizing both the visibility of the sacrament and the invisibility of the reality. The realism is evident in passages which tell of the Lord giving us his flesh

⁴³DSC, 36, p. 99: "sed omnibus veritatis amatoribus ut mihi credant qui forte hoc legerint, proponere, gloriam me habere testimonium conscientiae meae, nulla me umquam contra veritatem catholicam confinxisse, nulla depravasse scripturarum loca, nulla te veritate Luciano me vel Isicio similem scribere potuisse."

⁴⁴DSC, 36, p. 99: "qua fraude fingis non inventa, qua astutia depravas inventa, qua pervicacia detorquere conaris, quae relinquis illesa."

⁴⁵DSC, 43, p. 147: "hoc tamen beati Augustini dictum putare potuit suffragari ineptiae suae, quod solum omnino ad adnullandum sufficit vecordiam ipsius."

⁴⁶DSC, 43, p. 147: "cecavit cor ejus malicia ipsius."

to eat and his blood to drink;⁴⁷ which exhort the believer to receive in bread what hung on the cross.⁴⁸ But Berengarius accuses Lanfranc of a false interpretation based on the mere appearance of the words "eat" and "drink". He calls it foolishness for Lanfranc to think that Augustine meant Christ's flesh to be eaten with the teeth; Augustine, according to Berengarius, was rather discussing the inner refreshment of the faithful.⁴⁹ The visible element of the sacrament is that which is corruptible, the invisible remains.⁵⁰ Indeed, it is the invisible reality which nourishes the man who receives the visible element.⁵¹ According to Augustine, the visible body of Christ is risen and remains in one location; the invisible reality is here with us in the sacrament.⁵² Bread and wine are seen on the altar; faith knows them to be in reality the

⁴⁷DSC, 43, p. 145: "Vere magnus dominus et magna misericordia ejus, vere, qui nobis dedit manducare corpus suum in quo tanta perpassus est, et sanguinem bibere." Augustinus, En. in Ps. 33, 22; PL 36, 321.
⁴⁸DSC, 44, p. 150: "Ostendit, quid sit non sacramento tenus, sed revera corpus Christi manducare et ejus sanguinem bibere, hoc est enim in illo manere ut in illo maneat et Christus." Augustinus, De civitate dei, 21, 25, 4; PL 41, 742.

⁴⁸DSC, 43, p. 146: "Hoc accipite in pane, quod pependit in cruce, et hoc accipite in calice, quod effusum est de Christi latere."

⁴⁹DSC, 43, p. 147: "Christi caro non dilaniatur, non venditur, sed spiritu manducatur. Unde illud: qui manducat corde."

⁵⁰DSC, 44, p. 150: "Si enim ad res ipsas visibiles de quibus sacramenta tractantur animum conferamus, quis nesciat eas esse corruptibiles, si autem ad id quod per illas agitur quis non videat non posse corrumpi." Augustinus, De bapt. contra Donat., 3, 10; PL 43, 145.

⁵¹DSC, 44, p. 151: "Qui credit in eum, manducat eum. Invisibiliter saginatur, quia invisibiliter renascitur." Augustinus, In Joan. tr., 26, 1; PL 35, 1607.

⁵²DSC, 44, p. 151: "Donec secundum finiatur, sursum est dominus, sed tamen etiam hic nobiscum est veritas dominus. Corpus enim in quo surrexit uno loco esse oportet, veritas autem ejus ubique diffusa est." Augustinus, In Joan. tr., 30, 1; PL 35, 1632. This text touches on an

body and blood of Christ.⁵³ Berengarius' obviously approving use of these texts from Augustine indicates his acceptance of the real presence. He draws from them to support his own position that visible bread is the expression of the unseen reality of the body of Christ.

In the passages quoted by Berengarius, Jerome seems to take the body in the Eucharist as spiritual and other than the flesh which was crucified. He speaks of a double knowledge of the body of Christ: the spiritual flesh which is eaten, and the flesh which was crucified.⁵⁴

Jerome gives the word of the Lord as the cause of the new being given to his flesh and blood--they are as truly nourishing for man as are food and drink.⁵⁵ The texts quoted from Jerome thus bear out Berengarius' notion of true spiritual nourishment from the Eucharist whereby man is interiorly strengthened and thus enabled to strengthen other men.⁵⁶ Such nourishment can only result from a real change in the elements.

important element in Berengarius' position which is discussed in Chapter VI. In Augustine he finds support for the distinction between body localized in one place and really present elsewhere.

⁵³DSC, 44, p. 152: "Quo videtis in altari panis est et calix, quod vobis etiam oculi vestri renunciant; quod autem fides postulat instruenda, panis est corpus Christi et calix sanguinis." Augustinus, Sermo 272, PL 38, 1246. The distinction expressed by Augustine between the visible elements and the reality present is important for Berengarius' doctrine. Cf. Chapters V, VI, VII.

⁵⁴DSC, 45, p. 154: "Dupliciter . . . intelligitur caro Christi et sanguis, vel spiritualis illa atque divina de qua ipse ait: caro mea vere est cibus et sanguis meus vere est potus, . . . vel caro et sanguis quae crucifixa est et qui militis effusus est lancea." Hieronymus, Comm. in ep. ad Ephesios, 1, 7; PL 26, 481A.

⁵⁵DSC, 45, p. 154: "Quia omne opus ejus sanctum est et omnis sermo ejus verus est, caro ejus verus est cibus et sanguis ejus verus est potus."

⁵⁶DSC, 45, p. 155: "Ut ergo diximus omnis homo habet aliquem in se cibum ex quo, qui sumpserit, siquidem bonus est et de bono thesauro profert bona mundum cibum praebet proximo suo."

The effect of the change is evident in the texts of Ambrose which emphasize the presence of a life-giving and saving substance in the bread and wine.⁵⁷

Liturgical texts clearly show the double presence of the earthly and the spiritual, the one taken by the mouth, the other received by the heart.⁵⁸ It is the earthly substance which brings the divine to man.⁵⁹ In the changeable creature, bread, man can accept the unchanging body of Christ for his salvation.⁶⁰ Berengarius is accumulating evidence for his belief in a visible sacrament as the expression of the reality of the body of Christ.

The words of Gregory the Great seem to sum up what has preceded: "Simple truth does nothing through duplicity; he showed himself to be the same to them in body as he was among them in spirit."⁶¹ The emphasis is again on the same reality, regardless of the manner of presence.

For Berengarius, the writings of the Fathers and the prayers of the liturgy, taken in their proper meaning within the context, provide a valid criterion for the truth of eucharistic faith.

⁵⁷DSC, 45, p. 155: "In ista carne ac sanguine nil cruentum, nil corruptibile mens humana concipiat, sed vivificatricem substantiam atque salvatricem, in pane et vino." Ambrosius, Comm. in Hebr., 5, 6.

⁵⁸DSC, 45, p. 158: "quod ore contingimus, domine, puro corde capiamus, et de munere temporali salus nobis aeterna proveniat."

⁵⁹DSC, 47, p. 162: "munera nostra nativitatis hodiernae misteriis apta proveniant, ut sicut homo genitus idem refulsit deus, sic nobis haec terrena substantia conferat quod divinum est."

⁶⁰DSC, 47, p. 163: "Gratias exhibemus tibi, domine, quod etiam temporalem hac mutabilem creaturam panem atque vinum, quae de mensa tua secundum corpus accipimus, ad salutem nobis animae valere instituisti."

⁶¹DSC, 47, p. 166: "nichil simplex veritas per duplicitatem fecit, talem se eis exhibuit in corpore, qualis apud illos erat in mente." Gregorius, XL Hom. in ev., 2, 23; PL 76, 1182C.

Role of Reason

According to Berengarius, it is the role of reason to seek the truth, to accept it on the basis of faith and authority, and to proceed toward a deeper understanding. Faith is the basis of knowledge, but must be aided by reason.⁶² Reason can arrive at guide lines for belief as to what the rule of faith admits and what it excludes.⁶³ The gospels and patristic writings provide a sound source of truth against which opinion does not hold.⁶⁴ Thus, the understanding of the faith is not a blind acceptance such as Lanfranc seems to advocate. And Berengarius chides him with speaking foolishly to say he would prefer to be catholic with the crowd even though reason and authority were lacking to him. For, says Berengarius, it is impossible to be catholic without authority.⁶⁵ Thus, Berengarius uses reason to refute such a rash statement.⁶⁶

Berengarius prefers the truth to the crowd. Truth can escape a large group. In fact, truth is scarcely ever sought and found in a multitude,⁶⁷ for, a crowd is not suitable enough to a more diligent question-

⁶²DSC, 3, p. 3: "Constat enim etiam modicum in aecclesia eruditus, non dicere apostolum de puritate fidei, per quam itur sed de evidentia rei, ad quam est perveniendum."

⁶³DSC, 3, p. 3: "sicut constare apud eruditum fidelem oportet usquequaque quid admittat fidei regula, quid excludat."

⁶⁴DSC, 13, p. 21: "non mea, non tua, sed evangelica apostolicaque simul autenticarum scripturarum, quibus contraire fas non sit, est sententia." Yet, some have claimed that for Berengarius neither authority, nor exegesis, nor theology counted. Clerval, p. 131.

⁶⁵DSC, 12, p. 20: "si etiam deesset mihi ratio et auctoritas, quibus fidem tuerer meam, mallet tamen cum vulgo esse catholicus quam tecum facetus hereticus."

⁶⁶DSC, 13, p. 21: "cum vulgo sine auctoritate vel tua ad vulgus, vel vulgi ad te non posse esse catholicum."

⁶⁷DSC, 13, p. 22: "vix unquam in multitudine satis bene quaesitam inventamque veritatem."

ing of truth.⁶⁸ Truth is the governing principle of Berengarius' faith, not the truth of human reason, but the truth of divine wisdom. Berengarius speaks of Christ as "ipsa veritas" who confirms the revelation from the Father.⁶⁹

High regard for truth is quite evident throughout Berengarius' writing. He asks the lovers of truth to bear with his repetition and detailed exposition in order that the truth may be correctly perceived.⁷⁰ It is sought with divine aid⁷¹ and secured on evidence from authentic writings. Berengarius carefully notes the place from which he is quoting when he refers to the works of Ambrose and Augustine.⁷² He does not base his arguments on the sole evidence of the senses, nor even primarily so. Rather, Berengarius challenges Lanfranc's assertion of the body being on the altar according to the senses; yet, he does not challenge, but asserts the presence of the body in reality.⁷³ Thus he does not consider it true to say that the body as it is in itself is visibly on the altar; yet it is true that according to faith, based on the testimony of revelation,

⁶⁸DSC, 13, p. 22: "multitudinem non esse idoneam satis ad diligentiorē veritatis inquisitionem atque perceptionem."

⁶⁹DSC, 14, p. 24: "ipsa veritas dicens."

⁷⁰DSC, 41, p. 131: "veniam a veritatis amatoribus postulo, qui malunt ex mora et lima in perceptione veritatis sudare, quam in errore sibi aliquo per ignaviam adquiescere."

⁷¹DSC, 41, p. 132: "propicia divinitate"

⁷²DSC, 41, p. 132: "Unde necessarium putavi de sexti etiam illius sermonis et verborum et sententiae evidentia manifestam facere, donante ipsa veritate, vecordissimam hominis, qui haec pervertere non dubitavit, superbiam."

⁷³DSC, 41, p. 138: "contra perspicuae evidentiam veritatis, quia in evidenti res est Christi corpus tam pro toto quam pro parte minime nunc posse esse incipere, contra propheticae, evangelicae, apostolicae."

the body of Christ is present.⁷⁴ Given this, he then challenges his opponent on the evidence of truth, asserting that his interpretation of texts of Ambrose is based, not on his own feeling, but on the evidence of truth.⁷⁵ For Berengarius, this is truth not from the evidence available to human reason through the senses, but primarily the reality of a thing as it is seen to be in the full light of the human intellect illumined by divine faith. Such truth is "evident" when it can be known by one who, having ascertained the truth from revelation and the teaching of the Church, applies human reason for a clearer understanding. This process is in complete accord with the method of Ambrose.⁷⁶ For Berengarius, then, the appeal to authority and the use of reason are the means of investigation for the divinely given truth.

Berengarius therefore challenges Lanfranc as betraying the truth. He accuses Lanfranc of contradicting reason when he claims that the flesh of Christ is invisible on the altar and yet is broken by the hand and chewed by the teeth. Such was the interpretation that Berengarius gave to the statement in the oath composed by Humbert, which Lanfranc defends.⁷⁷ Indeed he accuses Lanfranc of insulting his own learning to speak of an

⁷⁴DSC, 32, p. 78: "Ego propicia divinitate de perspicuitate veritatis accepi."

⁷⁵DSC, 32, p. 78: "De his auctorem illum comparabiliter tractare non de corde meo, sed de evidentia veritatis adverti."

⁷⁶DSC, 42, p. 141: "Tamquam diceret: Igitur, i.e. quia praemisi pendere te oportere ab apostoli Petri auctoritate et mea, hoc praemisso, etiam illud quod pertineat ad ratiocinationem infero."

⁷⁷PL 150, 411A: "et sensualiter non solum sacramento, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi et fidelium dentibus atteri."

invisible thing, which is broken, is chewed, has color.⁷⁸ Actually, the oath need not be interpreted in such a cannibalistic way, for Humbert is stating that bread and wine changed into the body and blood of Christ, are materially (sensualiter) broken and chewed. Lanfranc does maintain the presence of invisible flesh, but he does not claim this flesh to be perceptibly (sensualiter) present in the way he accuses him of doing.

Lanfranc's basic error, according to Berengarius, is the denial of the presence of bread on the altar, the assertion that bread ceases to be after the consecration.⁷⁹ His mistakes are many because he writes from feeling, not from truth.⁸⁰ Nor can his appeal to authority be honored, since time after time, Berengarius shows in argument that Lanfranc's claims have no truth, and are held by no authority.⁸¹ Berengarius never tires of claiming that Lanfranc writes from a desire to calumniate him, not from truth.⁸²

As for himself, Berengarius keeps the truth intact and fully in accord with the authority of Scripture and the Fathers. What he writes, he received from the prophets, from the apostles, from the Lord himself,

⁷⁸DSC, 42, p. 139: "Non minus contra evidentiam veritatis et contra eruditionem tuam erat quam maxime deliramentum illud tuum."

⁷⁹DSC, 38, p. 117: "Vecordia enim tua in eo est, ut subjectum panis per consecrationem absumptum esse desierit." Berengarius' own position is that the bread does not cease to be but is changed. It is what it appears to be and is changed into something more. This touches upon the very important notion of conversion which is developed in Chapter VII.

⁸⁰DSC, 21, p. 44: "Scribis . . . sed de corde tuo, non de veritatis perspicuo."

⁸¹DSC, 38, p. 110: "sicut de nulla veritate, ita de nulla habuisti auctoritate."

⁸²DSC, 28, p. 60: "de abundantia calumpniae scribis, non de veritate."

as well as from the authentic teachers in the Church.⁸³ His task as a scholar is to understand the faith. To understand faith is to know truth with the aid of reason and authority.

Berengarius answers quite clearly the charge that he abandons tradition and hides behind dialectics. Far from rejecting sacred authorities, Berengarius makes it a practice to begin from authority and then argue.⁸⁴ But authority does not displace reason. In fact, it is incomparably greater to act rationally in the perception of truth.⁸⁵ Augustine places reason before authority when he claims that human authority cannot be placed before the mind which reaches truth.⁸⁶ And he holds truth to be the criterion of both reason and authority.⁸⁷ Therefore to use dialectical means in order to clarify the truth is by no means an escape. It is to keep things in proper perspective, acknowledging and using the divinely illumined intellect, whereby man is most truly the image of God. For a man to be less than rational is for him to be less than the divinized

⁸³DSC, 45, p. 157: "hoc contra Lanfrannum rescripto nichil me tempore isto quantum ad mensam dominicam contra veritatem sensisse, omnia quae de ea scripsi, a propheta, ab apostolo, ab ipso prophetarum et apostolorum domino et invictissimis in ecclesia veritatis assertoribus Augustino, Ambrosio, Hilario, Gregorio, ut ceteros omittam, accepisse." This is contradictory to the claim that "Berengar of Tours was the first to construct of rationalist tendencies the substance of his theology." Sheedy, p. 15.

⁸⁴DSC, 23, p. 47: "deducendi sacras auctoritates in medium necessitate inde agendi."

⁸⁵DSC, 23, p. 47: "ratione agere in perceptione veritatis incomparabiliter superius esse, quia in evidenti res est."

⁸⁶DSC, 23, p. 47: "rationi purgatoris animae quae ad perspicuam veritatem pervenit auctoritas nullo modo humana praeponitur." Augustinus, *De vera relig.*, 35, 47; *PL* 34, 142.

⁸⁷DSC, 23, p. 47: "pudet inbecillitatis humane, cum rationi roborandae auctoritas quaeritur, cum auctoritate veritatis quae omni homine est melior nichil possit esse praestantius." Augustinus, *De musica*, 5, 5, 10; *PL* 32, 1152.

human being God intends him to be.⁸⁸ It is by dialectic that he discerns, that he is taught.⁸⁹ Learning is the pursuit of simplicity and truth, in which man seeks divine things, not only to be believed, but also to be contemplated, to be understood and retained.⁹⁰ Faith is the beginning of such a process; reason advances it on this earth; and vision brings it to fruition in glory.

Argumentation

Berengarius was by training and profession a grammarian and a dialectician. Words and argumentation were, thus, highly significant for him. They provided his method of attack on Lanfranc. Berengarius frequently derided either the arrangement of statements, or the lack of evidence for a certain conclusion. At times the construction of a sentence, the position of words, or the syntax is the reason for rejecting an idea. This method may be seen in Berengarius' argumentation on the meaning of the term sacramentum.⁹¹

⁸⁸DSC, 23, p. 47: "Maximi plane cordis est per omnia ad dialecticam confugere, quia confugere ad eam ad rationem est confugere, quo qui non confugit, cum secundum rationem sit factus ad imaginem dei, suum honorem reliquit, nec potest renovari de die in diem ad imaginem dei." This is the oft-quoted passage which is the basis for unjust charges that Berengarius was nothing but a rationalist: "dans divers milieux il se reconstruit des esprits tellement éblouis par les conquêtes de la dialectique qu'à leurs yeux la Bible perdait sa valeur et que tout cédait devant la raison, 'principal élément de notre ressemblance avec Dieu.' Un des plus remarquables produits de cette tendance est assurément Berenger." de Ghellinck, "Dialectique," Beitrag, p. 87. Berengarius regarded reason as a divinely illumined faculty by which he sought to explain truths already accepted on faith, with the aid of Scripture and the patristic writings.

⁸⁹DSC, 23, p. 47: "noui discere, noui docere."

⁹⁰DSC, 23, p. 48: "illa divina, non jam credenda solum, verum etiam contemplanda, intelligenda atque retinenda."

⁹¹The actual development of Berengarius' meaning of the term is left to a later chapter.

Berengarius makes a distinction in words. There are those which name a specific thing and can be applied only to a limited number of objects. Other words are general terms which mean nothing of themselves unless some specific word is designated. "Earth" tells us something definite, while "element" remains obscure. So, too, "bread" is a distinct kind of "nourishment". Sacramentum is one of the general terms which cannot exist by itself, but must be the sacramentum of something. A thing is a sign of a thing. This line of argumentation fills two purposes for Berengarius. There must be a thing, bread, to be the sign of another thing, the body of Christ. Thus, he argues, the bread remains. And the sacramentum must be of something. He cannot be said to deny the body of Christ. It is not necessary that the bread cease to be, but only that it become a sacrament. Of itself, bread is nourishment; after consecration, it is a sacrament of the body of Christ.⁹² Both bread and body must exist.

Another argument which Berengarius uses is that a thing must be before it can be something; a thing cannot be anything whatsoever if it ceases to be.⁹³ Socrates must be before he can be just. Nor can he cease

⁹²DSC, 15, p. 27: "Haec forte ad fastidium prosequor, quia dixisti meam esse sententiam qua dicitur: panis et vinum altaris solummodo sacramenta sunt, quod vecordissimum erat dictu. Dum enim dicitur: panis et vinum sacramenta sunt, minime panis aufertur aut vinum et nominibus rerum ita natarum significativis aptatur nomen quod non nata sunt ut est sacramentum; simul etiam esse aliud aliquid minime prohibentur, sunt enim sicut secundum religionem sacramenta, ita secundum aliud alimenta sustentamenta."

⁹³DSC, 20, p. 35: "Omne enim quod est aliud est in eo quod aliud est, in eo quod aliquid est, nec potest res ulla aliquid esse si desinat ipsum esse."

to be if he is to be just. So, bread must be if it is to be a sacrament. Nor can it cease to be and still be a sacrament. Likewise a figure or sacrament in order to be such must be a sign of something. In this instance, bread is the sacrament of the body of Christ. Again, both bread and body must exist.

This type of argumentation leads Berengarius to discuss the use of figurative language. It is a crucial point to understand since Berengarius' discussion of terms used literally (proprie) or figuratively (tropice) presents an apparent problem.⁹⁴ These passages can give the impression that he does not see Christ as really present, and are therefore a basis for charges that he denies the real presence.

Berengarius' argumentation proceeds from the statement made by Christ, "This (bread) is my body," and is directed against Lanfranc who, according to Berengarius, has said that the bread ceases to exist.

The proposition, this (bread) is my body, must be a true statement since Christ himself said it. Both terms must be true and the predication must be true. Although the statement presents problems, Berengarius never suggests discarding it, but strives to understand it.

In the polemic context of his thought, Berengarius is almost obsessed with the need to demonstrate that the bread does exist. His argument at this point does not touch upon the reality of the body, but is aimed at proving the reality of the bread. A subject term must exist if anything is to be predicated of it. To say that Christ is a cornerstone

⁹⁴To use the term "figuratively" might be misleading. Berengarius' use of tropice (here translated by figuratively) is drawn from the classical rhetorical terminology which designates a thing as what it appears to be (proprie) or as other than it appears to be (tropice). One of the finest works in this area is H. de Lubac, Exegèse médiévale, 4 v., Paris, 1959-1964.

is not to destroy Christ but to assert that he is. So, to say that bread is a sacrament, or that bread is the body of Christ, is to assert that bread exists.⁹⁵ Lanfranc objects to this reasoning but, as usual, takes a different approach to it. He upholds the belief that what is on the altar is no longer bread but the body of Christ. In answer to Berengarius' proposed argument, Lanfranc says that things cannot rightly be called by the name of the thing from which they come. So the body cannot be called bread except in a figurative way of speaking.⁹⁶ Further, he says, to say that Christ is a cornerstone is certainly figurative speech since no one thinks Christ is a stone.⁹⁷

Berengarius replies with force, incensed at the twist of his argument to sound as if he is equating the statements, Christ is a cornerstone, and bread is the body.⁹⁸ Both are examples of speaking figuratively,

⁹⁵PL 150, 415D: "Sicut enim qui dicit: Christus est summus angularis lapis, Christum non aufert, Christum esse omnino constituit; ita qui dicit: Panis altaris solummodo est sacramentum, vel: Panis altaris solummodo est verum corpus Christi, panem in altari esse non negat, panem et vinum esse confirmat in mensa Dominica."

⁹⁶PL 150, 416A: "Verum adnecteres, si ignarus veritatis priorem propositionis partem quisquam statueret, nisi forte figurato locutionis modo verbum illud proferret. Solemus enim aliquas res illarum rerum, ex quibus efficiuntur, nominibus appellare, quamvis, in aliam naturam translatae, jam non possint esse illud quod sunt res illae ex quibus probantur effectae."

⁹⁷PL 150, 416C: "Porro similitudo, quam de Domino Jesu Christo et lapide angulari posuisti, te impedit, nos expedit. Sicut enim qui dicit: 'Christus est lapis angularis,' non revera Christum lapidem esse constituit, sed propter aliquam similitudinem, quam ad se invicem gerunt, ei nomen imponunt; eodem modo cum divina pagina corpus Domini panem vocat, sacrata ac mystica locutione id agit, seu, quoniam ex pane conficitur ejusque nonnullas retinet qualitates."

⁹⁸DSC, 20, p. 36: "Porro quod scribis illud quod dixi: 'Christus est summus angularis lapis,' contra me facere, quia per similitudinem dicitur partes tuas munire, indiligenter apparet istud te posuisse. Constat enim apud eruditionem tuam non minus tropica locutione dici: panis, qui ponitur in altari, post consecrationem est corpus Christi et vinum sanguis, quam

as he goes on to explain. In formulating propositions, there are a limited number of terms which can be properly (proprie) predicated of any subject. Other terms, if predicated of that subject, are done so figuratively (tropice). Thus it is figurative speech to say that Christ is a cornerstone, or a lion, or a lamb. But in every case, the fact that Christ is the subject of predication asserts that Christ is. In figurative statements, the subject term is said properly or literally (proprie); the predicate term is said figuratively (tropice).⁹⁹ Berengarius makes no reference to the manner of existence of subject or predicate, but is concerned here merely with the manner of expression and the reality of the subject.

He applies the same reasoning to the statement about the bread. The subject term "bread" is used literally (proprie); the predicate term "body" is said figuratively (tropice). The bread as subject of predication must remain; nothing is said here of the reality of the predicate "body".

To clarify his argument, Berengarius cites the scriptural statement, "The rock was Christ."¹⁰⁰ Coming from revelation, the proposition is true.

dicatur Christus est leo, Christus est agnus, Christus est summus angularis lapis, totique illi tropicae locutionis generi unum patere non amplius exitum, ut ubicumque praedicatur non praedicabile, quia tropica locutio est de non susceptibili, alter propositionis terminus tropice, alter proprie accipitur."

⁹⁹*DSC*, 20, p. 36: "alter propositionis terminus tropice, alter proprie accipitur."

¹⁰⁰*DSC*, 20, pp. 36-37: "Verbi gratia: 'Petra Christus erat', inquit apostolus constatque subjectum terminum qui est petra illa quae in deserto manavit aquas, susceptibilem ejus praedicati quod est Christus, quod est homo deus, usquequaque non esse, hac per hoc, apostolicam illam propositionem subjectum terminum quod est petra propria locutione, praedicatum quod est Christus, tropica locutione habere; unde beatus Augustinus: 'petra Christus in signo, verus Christus', i.e. secundum rei proprietatem consideratus 'in carne et verbo'."

How is it to be understood? Christ cannot be properly predicated of the subject "rock". It is a figurative statement in which the subject "rock" is said literally (proprie), the predicate "Christ" figuratively (tropice). The rock appears as it is, as rock; Christ does not appear as he is but in the sign of rock. Berengarius quotes the interpretation of Augustine: "The rock is Christ in sign, true Christ in Word and in flesh," which he further interprets as "considered according to the properties of the reality." However, he does not at this point clarify the manner of existence of a term figuratively predicated. The main force of his argument is still aimed at establishing the reality of the subject term.

Berengarius proceeds to apply the method to the words of Christ. "This (bread) is my body."¹⁰¹ It cannot be a statement of proper predication since this individual body cannot be properly predicated of this individual bread. It does not have the characteristics proper to bread. Rather, the body spoken of is the human body born of the virgin. In the sacrament, it looks like bread and is body. Body is therefore predicated figuratively of the sacrament. Again, Berengarius does not pursue the question of the reality of the predicate term "body" but drives home his

¹⁰¹DSC, 20, p. 37: "Item cum dicit dominus de pane illo quem primo in privilegium promovit illud ut esset corpus ipsius, 'hoc' i.e. haec res, hic panis 'est meum corpus', non est locutus proprie, quia nec panis ille individuus, quem in eam provexerat dignitatem, ut digne sumptus valeret ad animae salutem, susceptibilis erat praedicati individui illius corporis, quod sibi in utero virginis dei sapientia fabricavit ita subjectus terminus, quod est panis, propria perpendendus est locutione, tropica praedicatus terminus, quod est in propositione meum corpus; nec quicquam pro te, omnino facit contra te enuntiatio illa, quae dicit: Christus est summus angularis lapis, quia sicut nulla ratione constabit propositio ista, si subjectum ejus locutione substuleris, ita nec ipsum quod dicit veritas ipsa verum esse constabit, si propositioni illi, quae dicit: hic panis est meum corpus, ubi subjectus terminus qui est panis propria non potest locutione non expendi, stupenda in tua eruditione vecordia panem deperisse contenderis sensualem; nec quicquam efficis dum in negotio investigandae veritatis contra eruditionem tuam, contra monachatum tuum non recta consistis."

contention that the subject term "bread" must exist. It is bread according to its own proper appearances.

This way of speaking raises the question of the reality of the body of Christ which cannot be adequately handled without an understanding of Berengarius' notions of sacrament and of conversion.¹⁰² These notions are discussed in later sections of this study.

When Lanfranc wishes to make the bread figurative, Berengarius charges that he is directly contrary to the words of the Lord himself. For Christ blessed real bread, he broke visible bread, he said of visible bread: Eat of this, for this, i.e. this reality, i.e. this perceptible bread is my body.¹⁰³ For Berengarius, the bread is not figurative, but actual. He cites Cyprian, too, as using bread in its literal sense; the body he uses not in its literal sense of that from the Virgin, but figuratively to designate the people of Christ.¹⁰⁴ Thus, Berengarius again concludes that in the proposition: the bread is the body of Christ, "bread" is used literally, "body" is figurative.

It is a totally different statement, according to Berengarius, to say: the body of Christ is the bread descended from heaven. For the

¹⁰²That Berengarius believes the body to be truly present although figuratively predicated of the sacrament seems clear from such texts as: DSC 36, p. 101: "Sicut enim generatum est corpus Christi praeter notam omnibus consuetudinem generandi, ita panis altaris convertitur in corpus Christi, ut sit panis qui erat, et corpus Christi quod non erat, praeter illam omnibus notam conversionem, secundum quam de eo quod est, instituitur esse quod non erat per corruptionem ipsius quod erat; haec autem conversio panis in corpus Christi intelligibilis est nec omnibus nota."

¹⁰³DSC, 20, p. 38: "manducate ex hoc, hoc enim, i.e. haec res, i.e. hic panis sensualis est corpus meum."

¹⁰⁴DSC, 20, p. 38: "quando dominus vocat corpus suum panem de multorum granorum adunatione congestum, populum indicat de gentibus adunatum." Cyprianus, Ep. 69, 5.

body of Christ does not become bread. The body in heaven is real; for Berengarius, it is material, visible, literal; "the bread descended from heaven" is a figurative term.¹⁰⁵ When Lanfranc says that the Scriptures are using figurative language in calling the body of Christ "bread," he is correct. But this does not prove his point that the bread on the altar is figurative, since he is speaking of the bread descended from heaven. The argument still stands: in the proposition, the bread is the body of Christ, "bread" is used literally, "body" is figurative.

In talking of sacramentum, Berengarius insists that it is a question of a material thing which becomes sacramentum by means of consecration. It is literal, not figurative, for actual bread is made sacramentum. But the body of Christ is not made in any way by consecration, and thus cannot be called sacramentum. It is the bread which is visible, material, literal. Recalling Ambrose's example of Melchisedec's offering, Berengarius rejects Lanfranc's appeal to figurative language. What Melchisedec offered and Abraham accepted was actual bread and wine. Berengarius interprets Ambrose's use of this incident as supporting his claim for the continued existence of bread after the consecration.¹⁰⁶

In the interpretation of figurative language in the words of Christ, Berengarius recommends the advice of Augustine: if what is read denies wickedness and wrong while ordering blessing and usefulness, it is not

¹⁰⁵DSC, 27, p. 57: "nec panis quem subjectum illa propositio habuit, qui propria locutione dicitur panis, unquam corpus Christi ante consecrationem altaris fuerit, corpus autem Christi numquam non fuerit ex quo esse cepit, tropica locutione dico, panis qui de celo descendit."

¹⁰⁶DSC, 30, p. 71: "Hac per hoc etiam vecordi constare debet panem et vinum secundum sensualem proprietatem, non secundum tropicam similitudinem Melchisedec optulisse, panem et vinum sensualiter Abraham, auctore Ambrosio, veneratum accepisse."

figurative speech. If it seems to command wickedness or wrong, to deny usefulness and blessing, it is figurative. Berengarius concludes that Christ used figurative language in commanding men to eat his flesh and drink his blood; he was not speaking of his body literally, but figuratively, in the sacramental form of bread.¹⁰⁷

From this argumentation, Berengarius concludes to a logically valid use of the term sacramentum for the bread, since in it one thing is seen, and another is known. Following Augustine, he contends that what is seen is bodily species; what is known is spiritual fruit.¹⁰⁸

Just as there is duality in man, since he is composed of body and soul, so in the sacrament there is a lower substance, bread, by which the body is refreshed and a higher substance, the body of Christ, which refreshes the soul.¹⁰⁹ There is a panis sensualis and a panis spiritualis. Berengarius considers it foolish of Lanfranc to say that this lower substance is the flesh of Christ and only figuratively called bread. He makes the flesh of Christ then liable to every corruption, which is a total contradiction of truth since the risen body is incorruptible.

A further argumentation of Berengarius proceeds from the principle

¹⁰⁷DSC, 34, p. 88: "Si enim hoc proprie sonat, non putetur figurata locutio. Si praeceptiva est flagitium aut facinus vetans, utilitatem aut beneficentiam jubens, non est figurata. Si facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere, utilitatem aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata est. Ubi dicit dominus: nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis et sanguinem biberitis, flagitium vel facinus videtur jubere. Figurata ergo locutio est, praeciens passioni domini esse communicandum et suaviter recondendum in memoria, quod caro ejus pro nobis crucifixa et vulnerata sit."

¹⁰⁸DSC, 34, pp. 88-89: "quod videtur, speciem habet corporalem, quod intelligitur, fructum habet spiritualement."

¹⁰⁹DSC, 27, p. 59: "Ita cum constet homo duabus substantiis, anima et corpore, potest qui velit appellare corpus subsubstantiam, animam supersubstantiam, panem sensualem quo reficitur corpus, subsubstantialem, panem spiritualement, i.e. Christi corpus quo reficitur anima, supersubstantialem."

that only the intellect can distinguish between the substantial reality of something and its accidents.¹¹⁰ It is incomprehensible to Berengarius that Lanfranc can claim that what is on the altar after the consecration is the flesh of Christ. What are seen are the qualities of bread, what Berengarius calls quod est in subjecto. Clearly, for Berengarius, bread does not take its being from its qualities; just as clearly, the color of bread cannot exist apart from bread. Yet, Lanfranc has written that the invisible flesh on the altar retains some of the qualities of bread.¹¹¹ To Berengarius, this is utter foolishness, most unworthy of a learned man. If the qualities of a subject remain, the subject itself must remain; it is impossible for qualities to exist of themselves.

Berengarius' expressions are verging on a sacramental terminology which will become more precise in the next centuries. While he speaks of "matter and form," of "subject and accidents," within a context of substance and accidents, he is not applying the scholastic interpretation of these words. For him, a thing is something by the very fact that it is; but no distinguishing accidents ever exist with-

¹¹⁰DSC, 38, p. 111: "novit eruditio tua subjectum, et quod sit in subjecto, solo intellectu discerni, ita ut subjectum non habeat ut sit ab eo quod est in subjecto eo, quod autem in subjecto est pro eo dicatur in subjecto esse quod a subjecto habeat ut sit; unde ignorare non potes, colorem vel quodcumque in subjecto sit, cum a se non habeat ut sit, nulla ratione ut oculis corporis videatur a se habere." Berengarius does not clearly utilize this distinction of substance and accidents. However, this seems to be quite clearly what he is discussing.

¹¹¹PL 150, 416C: "eodem modo cum divina pagina corpus Domini panem vocat, sacrata ac mystica locutione id agit, seu, quoniam ex pane conficitur ejusque nonnullas retinet qualitates."

out being something, i.e. without a subject.¹¹² Berengarius again calls Lanfranc a fool to claim that the subject of bread is destroyed through consecration, for according to Berengarius, not even the omnipotence of God can have accidents exist in a subject which does not exist. It is as if he said something is which has not yet begun to be. For Berengarius, if bread and wine essentially cease to be, nothing which had been in those subjects would be able to remain.¹¹³ He sarcastically rejects the idea of the accidents of bread existing in the flesh of Christ.¹¹⁴

Word order, too, plays its part in giving meaning to the sacrament. Thus, when Ambrose in answer to the objection, "I do not see the species of blood," responds, "but you have the likeness;"¹¹⁵ it is to be understood as a likeness of blood. This likeness of blood is wine made the sacrament of the blood of Christ. The likeness is of the thing of which it is the sacrament. Berengarius accuses Paschasius and Lanfranc of inverting the word order and speaking of the likeness of wine, which to him is again utter madness. To speak thus would mean that wine was not

¹¹²DSC, 38, p. 117: "Veritas enim hoc habet, unde superius satis egi, omne compactum ex materia et forma aliud esse in eo quod est, aliud in eo quod aliquid est, nec posse aliquid esse si contigerit ipsum non esse, i.e., quod secundum subjectum non sit, minime posse secundum accidens esse."

¹¹³DSC, 38, p. 117: "si panis et vinum a pristinis essentiis abstracta defecerunt, nulla, quae in subjectis eis fuissent, superesse poterunt."

¹¹⁴DSC, 38, p. 117: "carni autem quam in altari deum facere opinaris per generationem subjecti, facile erat deo, si ita se res haberet, apponere accidentia eadem his quae prius in pane fuissent et ita dici posse non panem esse specie, sed potius carnem a deo per subjecti generationem nunc factam, datis ei, qualia in pane fuerant, accidentibus, colore et accidentium paritate panem esse."

¹¹⁵DSC, 39, p. 122: "sed habet similitudinem." Ambrosius, De myst., 3, 8; PL 16, 408A.

left on the altar according to material quality but according to accidents;¹¹⁶ that blood was present according to material quality but hidden from sight.¹¹⁷ Against such foolishness, Berengarius maintains that the chalice does not contain the species of blood but the likeness of blood, i.e. wine made the sacrament of the blood.¹¹⁸ This is consistent with the Augustinian definition of sacraments as having the likeness of the things of which they are the sacraments.¹¹⁹ Sacraments are the bread and wine of Christ; they are also the likeness of the body and blood of Christ. Body and blood are present not properly, but sacramentally, i.e. not visibly in their own proper species, but visibly in the sacramental likeness, bread and wine.

Even the grammatical case of words can be used as an argument for Berengarius' main idea: a sacrament is visible; therefore, the bread remains. In the gospel account of the words of institution, bread is used in the accusative case: Christ took bread, he blessed bread, he broke bread. Ambrose, too, makes it objective, saying: he gave it broken. Berengarius reasons that "it" can only mean bread, for at the time, the Lord's body remained whole and entire. So, too, when the Lord said, "Eat, all, of this," the pronoun "this" must again refer to the same bread which was "broken". The same is true of the "this" in "This is my body."

¹¹⁶DSC, 39, p. 122: "minime . . . secundum materialem proprietatem, sed secundum accidens."

¹¹⁷DSC, 39, p. 122: "secundum materialem proprietatem, sed occultari oculis corporis."

¹¹⁸DSC, 39, p. 123: "Speciem sanguinis non habet calix, sed habet similitudinem sanguinis, i.e. vinum factum sacramentum ipsius sanguinis."

¹¹⁹DSC, 39, p. 125: "in beato Augustino in epistola ad Bonifacium episcopum: 'si sacramenta rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, similitudinem non haberent.'" Augustinus, Ep. ad Bonif., 98; PL 33, 363.

And the affirmation, "This (wine) is my blood," can only be true if it does not lose its subject, wine. Further, when Ambrose says: "Before it is consecrated, it is bread; when the words of Christ have been uttered over it, it is the body of Christ,"¹²⁰ it is necessary to understand bread itself to be the body of Christ. The conclusion Berengarius draws is that no one can deny the presence of the visible bread and wine on the altar.¹²¹

Language

In order to understand how Berengarius can say that this bread, visibly on the altar, is the body of Christ, it is necessary to study his use of words and the meaning these words have for him in the context of eucharistic presence.

It is to be noted first of all that the interpretation and use of words at the time of Berengarius was largely derived from the exegetical method of considering Scripture texts.¹²² Much of the learning up to this

¹²⁰DSC, 41, p. 130: "antequam consecratur, panis est; ubi verba Christi accesserint, corpus est Christi." Ambrosius, De sacr., 4, 5, 22, PL, 16, 463A.

¹²¹At this point of argumentation, Berengarius' point is that bread remains. He is not primarily interested in clarifying how the body is present. This he does in other passages.

¹²²"le vocabulaire relatif à cette action et à ce sacrifice est commandé en grande partie par le vocabulaire relatif aux deux Testaments." de Lubac, Corpus, p. 79. He sees this as one of two basic problems in a study of real presence, the other being: "la perspective essentielle de ces textes n'est pas celle d'une présence ou d'un objet, mais celle d'une action et d'un sacrifice." p. 78. In interpretation, it is important to remember that "il en est de l'Eucharistie comme de l'Ecriture. Ni l'une ni l'autre ne se suffit à elle-même en son sens littéral, quoique la foi doive y trouver d'abord son fondement. Pour être comprise en sa plénitude, elle doit être pénétrée par le moyen d'une 'intelligence spirituelle.'" p. 83.

time had been directed toward an understanding of Scripture. Theology and its vocabulary had developed in this atmosphere. Berengarius gives evidence of this background as he talks of the way in which the sacred writings are to be understood. Thus, he quotes at length from Jerome's advice on the interpretation of Scripture--how important it is to distinguish figure from literal truth; how necessary to accept the word of God spiritually, not carnally.¹²³ These same terms will be used also in speaking of the eucharistic presence.

Berengarius is aware of the significance of words and the importance of reaching a true meaning in context. In interpretation of a text, he advocates paying attention to what has been said previously, to the way in which what follows depends upon the preceding, to the relation of parts to the whole. Berengarius quotes the advice of Ambrose to "see the distinctions and properties of each single word."¹²⁴ Putting this advice into practice, he often corrects his opponent's use of words. He takes Lanfranc to task for saying that he had been deprived of communion by the condemnation of the council. For Berengarius, participation in the

¹²³DSC, 46, pp. 154-155: "Agnosce quia figurae sunt quae in divinis voluminibus scripta sunt, ideo tamquam spirituales et non carnales intelligite quae dicuntur. Si enim quasi carnales ista suscipitis, ledunt vos, non alunt; est enim et in evangeliiis littera quae occidat. Non solum in veteri testamento occidens littera deprehenditur, est et in novo testamento littera quae occidat eum qui non spiritualiter advertit Ecce haec littera evangelii est et occidit; si vero spiritualiter eam suscipias, non occidit, sed vivificans est in ea spiritus, et ideo sive in lege sive in evangeliiis quae dicuntur spiritualiter suscipe, spiritualiter dijudica."

¹²⁴DSC, 36, p. 100: "attenderis et in sermone et in scriptura, qualiter praecedentia posterioribus praescribant, posteriora a praecedentibus pendeant, qualiter pars quaecumque se toti suo debeat, et quod beatus Ambrosius admonet: 'vide distinctiones singulorumque verborum proprietates', et beatus Augustinus: appende verbum, cape inde consilium." Ambrosius, De fide ad Gratianum Augustum, 4, 9, 114, PL 16, 665C.

sacraments is not properly called communion, but communication. Unity of faith and piety of action is termed communion.¹²⁵

The words which most interest us are those which bear directly on the manner of eucharistic presence. How is bread said to be the body of Christ? Berengarius shows the way in which God deals with men, who being human have need of material things in order to know. God teaches man through the body. Thus, in the gospel story of the paralytic, Christ cures the man in body to show his power to forgive the man's sins.¹²⁶ It is a process of going to the unknown through the known.¹²⁷

The basic notion involved in an interpretation of Berengarius' use of language is concerned with the process of knowledge and the

¹²⁵DSC, 8, p. 10: "secundum nullam eruditionem scripsisti, quia participatio sacramentorum altaris numquam proprie communio dicitur, sed communicatio. Unitas fidei et in actionibus pietatis communio in scripturis nominatur autenticis." Augustinus, locum non inveni. This terminology is in keeping with the time as de Lubac explains: "au lieu de communio, on dira plutôt alors communicatio: c'est ainsi que chez Walafrid Strabon, la premier de ces deux mots désigne le lien du corps ecclésial, tandis que le second est réservé à l'acte de la communion sacramentelle." Corpus, p. 29. A twelfth-century writing lists the sacraments as: "Baptismus, paenitentia, confessio et communicatio corporis et sanguinis." Lottin, Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale, t. 3, p. 526. Berengarius was evidently aware of this distinction and of the relation of Eucharist and Church, although he makes little reference to it in this work.

¹²⁶DSC, 33, p. 86: "Dominus Jesus Christus, cum diceret paralitico: 'dimittuntur tibi peccata' et blasphemare eum putarent qui minime deum esse credebant, 'ut sciatis', inquit, 'quia filius hominis potestatem habet dimittere peccata: surge et ambula', manifeste demonstrans ad hoc se oculis corporis magnitudinem exhibuisse ut qui in altero crederent, in altero assensum non negarent, qui pro miraculo restituti corporis deum cogitare pergerent, de divina ejus potentia ad dimittenda peccata minime dubitarent. Ita beatus Ambrosius cum ad objectorem suum diceret: 'hoc nobis superest ut probemus', et adderet: 'quantis igitur utimur exemplis', ad comparandum sibi circa alia auditoris assensum de virga et serpente de aquis et sanguine voluit in memoriam revocare." Ambrosius, De myst., 9, 50, PL 16, 422C.

¹²⁷DSC, 35, p. 93: "de obscuris recurrendum esse ad manifesta, sicut de imis est progrediendum ad summa."

distinction between knowing spiritualiter or corporaliter. It is thus not a question of the objective thing which is known as much as of the way in which the thing is known. For Berengarius, the manifest, by which the obscure is known, is expressed by such terms as visibile, species, lux, veritas, corpus, forma, natura, verum. What is known spiritualiter is invisibile, intelligibile, mysterium; it is known in similitudine, umbra, figura, or imago.¹²⁸

A thing is known corporally in so far as it affects the bodily senses; this is an external knowledge based on material contact. But the same thing will be known spiritually in its effect on the interior man, in the meaning and significance given to the material by the illumined intellect.¹²⁹

This is the very way in which Christ intended his words to be understood. When he spoke to his followers of eating his flesh, he intended not that the words be understood carnally, but that they be accepted spiritually. Eternal life was promised not for physical eating but for spiritual acceptance.¹³⁰

Berengarius singles out the distinction

¹²⁸Cf. de Lubac, Corpus, pp. 64-65; 210-247.

¹²⁹DSC, 45, p. 157: "ad interiorem hominem pertinere refectionem fidelium de corpore et sanguine domini dei sui et spiritualiter, non corporaliter, excepto quod ad sacramentum pertinent, fieri in homine interiori, solum sacramentum visibile hominem exteriorem ore visibiliter sumere."

¹³⁰DSC, 43, p. 146: "Durus est illis visum quod ait: 'nisi quis manducaverit carnem meam, non habebit vitam eternam'. Acceperunt illud stulte, carnaliter illud cogitaverunt et putaverunt, quod praecisurus esset dominus particulas quasdam de corpore suo et daturus illis et dixerunt: durus est hic sermo. Ipsi duri erant, non sermo. Et paucis intermissis, 'spiritualiter', inquit, 'intelligite quod locutus sum'." It is hard to accept such judgments as: "For Berengar, . . . the eye pierces to the essence itself; the corporeal object is sensible by its essence; it is all that the senses tell us it is, and it is nothing but that." Sheedy, p. 67.

as a basis for the controversy over his teaching with those members of the hierarchy who are not able to endure talk of a spiritual eating at the Lord's table.¹³¹ He was never able to explain his position to the pope and the bishops who were closing their ears to the voice of spirituality.¹³²

Berengarius distinguishes what is known corporally as visible, perceptible; what is known spiritually as invisible, grasped by the intellect. In the sacrifice of the altar, the sacrament is visible, the reality signified is invisible. While the sacrament is received visibly, the body of Christ is received invisibly.¹³³ For Berengarius, the sacramentum is visible; so, also, the risen body of Christ is visible in heaven. But this risen body, as it is manifest by the sacramentum, is invisible to us on earth and can be known only by faith.¹³⁴

As Augustine expresses it: Those things are called sacraments because in them one thing is seen and another is known. What is seen has bodily appearance, what is known has spiritual fruit.¹³⁵ Here, what is

¹³¹ DSC, 14, p. 25: "spiritualitatis nomen in refectione mensae dominicae . . . audire potuisse."

¹³² DSC, 18, p. 30: "qui nec audire poterant spiritualement de Christi corpore refectionem et ad vocem spiritualitatis aures potius opturabant."

¹³³ DSC, 47, p. 164: "Sacrificium tuum de visibili constat et invisibili, sacramento et re sacramenti. Presta ergo ut, dum secundum visibile nostrum quod visibile habet sacrificium tuum sumimus, i.e. sacramentum, etiam invisibili nostro, i.e., cogitatione, sumamus, quod invisibiliter habet altaris sacrificium, i.e. corpus tuum ad adquiescendum nobis in illo ad gratias agendum, quod etsi est visibile, non tamen usque in tempora restitutionis omnium aspectibus redditur hominum."

¹³⁴ DSC, 36, p. 101: "haec autem conversio panis in corpus Christi intelligibilis est nec omnibus nota."

¹³⁵ DSC, 44, p. 152: "Ista, fratres, ideo dicuntur sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur et aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur, speciem habet corporalem, quod intelligitur, fructum habet spiritualement." Augustinus, Sermo 272, PL 38, 1246.

bodily visible is called the species; the interior effect which comes by understanding is termed fructus spiritualis.¹³⁶ The bread and wine retain their visible appearance even though through the consecration they become the body and blood of Christ.¹³⁷ The species, the sensible appearance, do not constitute the thing, but make the thing known to the senses.¹³⁸ To clarify this point, Berengarius quotes Augustine as denying that the species are sanctified by consecration; it is rather the subject which is sanctified, not what is in the subject.¹³⁹

A final term whose clarification is important to this study is veritas (verum, vere). It is the total reality of a thing which is what it is supposed to be. This reality (veritas) can be manifested sensibly, but the term is not limited to reality externally expressed as such; it can also refer to the reality as known intellectually.

So, Berengarius claims the reality (veritas) of the body of Christ is made evident in the incarnation and the passion.¹⁴⁰ It is a

¹³⁶This terminology was widely used following Augustine, but no one thereby "songe à contester la présence sacramentelle d'où résultera de 'fruit spirituel'." Rather, they discover "l'union réelle avec le Christ, non pas tant à travers la présence réelle, mais à travers le signe, et cette union n'est pas tant l'union individuelle que celle des individus entre eux dans le Christ." de Lubac, Corpus, p. 24.

¹³⁷DSC, 34, p. 87: "Quando ad altare afferuntur, secundum species suas existunt, ut proficiant in aliud quam erant, benedictionem accipiunt, ita corpus Christi et sanguis fiunt per consecrationem altaris."

¹³⁸Cf. above, p. 129, n. 110: DSC, 38, p. 111.

¹³⁹DSC, 34, pp. 88-89: "quod videtur, speciem habet corporalem, quod intelligitur, fructum habet spirituales, et ne pervertas quod dicit: speciem, attende quod apponit: corporalem, attende quod dicit in libro de catezizandis rudibus: nec sic habendam speciem benedictione sanctificatam. Non enim sanctificatur quod in subjecto est, sed subjectum." Augustinus, De cat. rudibus, 26, 50, PL 40, 344.

¹⁴⁰DSC, 41, p. 134: "quia incarnatio et passio corporis asserit veritatem."

true human body which was born and which endured suffering and death. The body as it is received in the Eucharist is not visible in itself;¹⁴¹ yet it is the true (verum) body of Christ.¹⁴² This is why there must be not only a corporal eating of the sacramentum, but a spiritual eating as well if the action is to be effective and fruitful. Not only must the Christian accept the visible bread, but he must accept in faith the true body.¹⁴³ The bread is the sacrament of that body which in its own proper appearances of flesh and blood was crucified and buried.¹⁴⁴ It is the sacrament of the reality which became life-giving for all men when Christ offered it for our salvation.¹⁴⁵ This is the veritas of the body of Christ which is manifested sensibly in heaven and sacramentally in the Eucharist.

Conclusions

The polemic nature of this work and Berengarius' deep personal

¹⁴¹DSC, 42, p. 139: "Dum enim . . . concedit non videri in altari carnem Christi, concedit autem videri similitudinem carnis."

¹⁴²DSC, 42, p. 142: "Accipis sacramentum in similitudinem iens, i.e. attendens quod ipsum sacramentum [sic] similitudo sit verae naturae, i.e. corporis quod non fantasticum, quod dicunt Manichei, sed verum Christus habuit."

¹⁴³DSC, 41, p. 134: "Christus instituisset commemorari oportere populum suum comestione corporali et bibitione ad spiritualem refectionem de incarnatione verbi et passione, quia incarnatio et passio corporis asserit veritatem."

¹⁴⁴DSC, 42, p. 142: "vera utique caro Christi est, quae crucifixa est, quae sepulta est. Vere ergo carnis illius sacramentum est."

¹⁴⁵DSC, 43, p. 149: "Non enim prius effecta est beatifica caro illa corpus sacerdotis nostri, quam factus est homo ille sacerdos noster in utero virginis, potuitque, si ita salvatori hominum placuisset, caro illa effecta in utero virginis corpus sacerdotis nostri appellari caro sacrificii nostri, quia eam Christus dominus pro salute nostra optulit, etiam si nichil institutum esset ecclesiae de sacramentis altaris."

concern hindered development of a clear style or adherence to a definite method.¹⁴⁶ Yet, a careful study of the text reveals Berengarius as a skilled lecturer and a learned man. The debate form whereby he cites a statement of Lanfranc and proceeds to demolish it piece by piece may well have been characteristic of the academic circles of his day.¹⁴⁷ The repetitious return to the same point from an infinite variety of approaches may indicate the heat of argument; it may also reveal a trait of the effective teacher. No doubt Berengarius is on the defensive; he has been hurt by the challenge of his fellow scholars, by the condemnations of the Church, by the desertion of his friends. Personal feeling comes through strongly. But the overriding concern of the argument is for the truth. Berengarius answers each criticism and sets forth his opinion on the matter in question, his interpretation of the specific text, or the reasoning behind his conclusion. Despite the confusion of the situation, there is a remarkable consistency that leaves the main issue crystal clear. He is well within the Christian tradition of fides quaerens intellectum, but, unfortunately for him, at a time when the process of human understanding was undergoing a radical change.¹⁴⁸ Berengarius, steeped in the old and tinged with the

¹⁴⁶"As a disquisition it is amorphous, as a composition it entirely lacks the qualities of the beautiful epistle to the hermits. The elliptical and frequently almost untranslatable syntax, the disorderly treatment of topic after topic, pursuing no sequence of ideas, and guided by fits and starts of emotional recollection rather than by methodical thought--the mind occupied for a few moments with a subject springing forth from the welter of badly correlated notions which crowded his brain, then seizing upon another--the book will always be a cause of despair, save to the most patient of readers." Macdonald, Berengar, p. 300.

¹⁴⁷For instance, Berengarius was asked to stop at Chartres and publicly discuss his views. Macdonald, Berengar, pp. 68-69.

¹⁴⁸"Plus profondément, plus universellement, c'est une mentalité nouvelle qui se repand, c'est un nouvel ordre de problèmes qui surgit et capte l'intérêt, c'est un nouveau mode de penser, ce sont de nouvelles

new, is unable to achieve the synthesis of thought which would permit clarification of doctrine and precision of expression.¹⁴⁹

Berengarius seems to have had a legitimate complaint against the use of authority by those with whom he dealt. He lived in insecure times when every type of power was struggling to maintain and establish itself. Force was used freely and Berengarius was the victim of both ecclesiastical and royal might. He acknowledged the validity of authority but, in true medieval tradition, expected truth to be done as well as thought. When men in power did not act in truth, there was no question of accepting or rejecting authority. Even then, Berengarius submitted to the office but protested loudly against the official.

He could see no truth in a sacrament that is invisible, or in a belief that the flesh of Christ is broken and chewed. If any man, be he pope or cardinal or bishop, in fact, if all men, professed such a belief, Berengarius would deny it. In so doing, he was not rejecting the teaching of the Church, but the false teaching of men. Force could and did make him repeat the words of submission, but no one could ever force him to adopt the belief. Yet, his loyalty to the Church remained firm; he would

catégories qui se forment. l'intelligence entre dans un nouvel âge, dont Bérenger de Tours, si médiocre que soit son génie, est cependant l'un des premiers témoins et des plus vigoureux artisans. La foi est alors assez vivace pour éliminer aussitôt son erreur; . . . Mais le symbolisme dans lequel cette foi s'exprimait et s'épanouissait est blessé à mort." de Lubac, Corpus, p. 256.

¹⁴⁹It is hard to find in the text taken as a whole and in the light of Berengarius' background, sufficient evidence to validate charges that Berengarius is an Aristotelian and a Nominalist; critic of faith and Scripture; has little use for the argument of authority; appeals to reason alone to decide; submits reason to the senses and makes sensible experience the unique means of knowledge. It is hoped that this study gives a clearer view of Berengarius' mentality and faith. Cf. Clerval, pp. 119-120 for criticisms of Berengarius.

do nothing to mar the unity of faith.

In keeping with his training at Chartres, and in reply to Lanfranc, Berengarius quotes profusely from the Latin Fathers and the liturgy. The Greek Fathers are not mentioned, nor are the early writings quoted, except for those of Cyprian. To be sure, Berengarius finds support for his position in the texts he quotes, but he makes an effort to place the text within the whole of an author's work in order to clarify its meaning. He accuses Lanfranc in return of the misuse of texts and besieges him with quotations to show him how false his interpretation has been.¹⁵⁰ In fact, Berengarius seems quite adept at the medieval art of appeal to authority for an understanding of truth.

In the process of learning, Berengarius recognizes divine truth, revelation, and the illumined intellect as the starting point.¹⁵¹ To call him a rationalist is to misinterpret the whole development of medieval thought.¹⁵² No Christian of his age distinguished a natural reason. Any man of his Augustinian background would recognize, as he did, the human intellect as the image of God in man. This was the most divine part of

¹⁵⁰"une sorte de florilège patristique à l'adresse de Lanfranc." Cappuyns, *DHGE*, 405.

¹⁵¹The medieval mind cannot be well-known by one who says: "Berengar claims for himself, as a gift of God, a special inward apprehension of the truth, and asserts that he was the only man of wisdom among the madmen who condemned him." Sheedy, p. 40.

¹⁵²An excellent insight into what was happening in the intellectual world of the eleventh century is found in K. Barth, *Anselm: Fides Quaerens Intellectum*, New York, 1960. Cf. also E. Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*, New York, 1952; *Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages*, New York, 1938; *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy*, New York, 1940; and D. Knowles, *The Evolution of Medieval Thought*, New York, 1964.

man. Truth was a given. Reasoning was a process toward an understanding of truth which would reach fulfillment in vision.

Faith was the basis of knowledge. The evidence of the gospels, patristic writings, and human experience provided criteria for further understanding of the faith. Dialectics is particularly useful in a system of truth, since all things must be ordered in their relation to the ultimate truth. The end desired is not rational knowledge, but the contemplation of truth.

One of the aspects of Berengarius' method which is most important to an understanding of his sacramental teaching is the distinction he makes between proper predication (propria locutione) and figurative predication (tropica locutione). A statement is to be understood as figurative if the predicate term cannot be properly predicated of the subject. In such a case, the subject term is used literally (propria locutione), the predicate term is used figuratively (tropica locutione). This does not say that the predicate term exists only figuratively, but that in predication it is said figuratively.

In his argumentation at this point, Berengarius does not attempt to establish the manner of existence of the predicate term. He is very much concerned to demonstrate the reality of the subject term. He can then argue that the statement, "This (bread) is my body," asserts the reality of the bread in the Eucharist. It is his purpose to oppose Lanfranc's claim that bread is no longer on the altar after consecration.

The relation of Berengarius to his predecessors is quite evident. The words and phrases by which he expresses his eucharistic faith are not new to Christian minds. But meanings are becoming more precise and it is possible that Berengarius does not realize this fact. Occasionally he

tries to determine the meaning of a word by seeing how it is used in other places in the same text. For the most part, he presumes that the words used by Ambrose and Augustine had the same meaning for them as he gives to them. His vocabulary is particularly close to that of Ratramnus, but two centuries have intervened. Berengarius accepts the thought of Ratramnus, but he sees it in the light of his own convictions.¹⁵³ This becomes evident in his notion of sacramentum and of the Eucharist as corpus Christi.

¹⁵³Berengarius was not really an innovator, but he did have some originality. "Cette originalité consiste avant tout dans une présentation plus dialectique, plus radicale aussi et plus développée du spiritualisme de Ratramne, dans une interprétation plus subtile et plus poussée des textes scripturaires; enfin dans une documentation patristique plus riche et quelquefois mieux choisée." Cappuyns, DHGE, 405.

CHAPTER V

THE MEANING OF SACRAMENT (SACRAMENTUM) FOR BERENGARIUS

In any study of eucharistic presence, a basic concept for consideration is necessarily that of sacramentum. The understanding of sacramental presence depends to a great extent on the precise meaning given to sacrament. It will be necessary to examine first what Berengarius has to say about sacrament, as well as what seem to be for him the essential aspects of the concept.

One of the key elements in the thought of Berengarius is his notion of sacramentum as visible. This characteristic dominates his entire discussion of the Eucharist. It can be clearly seen in his definition of sacramentum, and in the relation he recognizes between sacramentum and res. The fact that a sacrament is necessarily visible affects also his view of the role of consecration and of the effect of the sacrament. Each of these points is quite evident in the text of the De Sacra Coena.

Definition

There can be no doubt that Berengarius formulated his definition of sacrament from an Augustinian tradition. In a letter written to Adelman of Liège before the controversy had attained public notice, Berengarius quoted no less than six Augustinian definitions of sacrament and a definition of sign: a sacrament is a sacred sign, the visible form of invisible grace, the visible sign of an invisible divine reality, the sign of a divine mystery; visible sacrifices are signs of the invisible

just as words are signs of things; and a sign is a sensible thing which makes known something else beyond the species.¹ In the De Sacra Coena, as well as in the work refuted by Lanfranc, Berengarius cites yet another Augustinian definition: if sacraments do not have a likeness to the things of which they are sacraments, they are not sacraments at all.² Thus, a total of eight Augustinian definitions explicitly enter into Berengarius' thought on sacrament.³ He is careful to note the exact source of each statement, except in the instance of the definition which is the basis of his thought: a sacrament is the visible form of invisible grace. This he claims he found "in a certain epistle." In the De Sacra Coena, he uses the definition four times, with vague references to the source.⁴

¹Martène et Durand, 4, p. 112: "Interpretatur autem sacramentum a B. Augustino in de civitate dei ita: sacramentum, id est, sacrum signum. . . . Secundum superiorem interpretationem diffinit B. Augustinus sacramentum in quadam epistola: Sacramentum est invisibilis gratiae visibilis forma. In libro de catechizandis rudibus: Sacramentum est divinae rei invisibilis signaculum visibili. In libro de paenitentia: Sacramentum est divini mysterii signaculum. In libro contra Faustum: Non sunt aliud quaeque sacramenta corporalia nisi quaedam quasi verba visibilia, sacrosancta quidem, sed tamen mutabilia et temporalia, Augustinus in libro de civitate dei: Sacrificia visibilia signa sunt invisibilium, sicut verba sonantia signa sunt rerum. Signum etiam idem B. Augustinus diffinit in libro de doctrina christiana: Signum est res praeter speciem quam ingerit sensibus, aliud aliquid ex se faciens in cognitionem venire."

²DSC, 44, p. 150: "In epistola ad Bonifacium episcopum: Si enim sacramenta quandam similitudinem rerum earum quarum sunt sacramenta non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent." Augustinus, Ep. ad Bonif., 98, PL 33, 363. Also in Lanfranc, PL 150, 422B.

³Cf. Geiselmann, Die Eucharistielehre, pp. 293-295, for a commentary on each of the definitions.

⁴DSC, 26, p. 55: "praescribente beato Augustino." Augustinus, Quaest. in Hept. in Levit., 84; PL 34, 712. DSC, 36, p. 105: "inquit." DSC, 36, p. 105: "cum dicit beatus Augustinus." Berengarius here relates the definition to another statement of Augustine's: "ubi dicit: Signacula non panis et vini, sed rerum divinarum sunt visibilia, sed res invisibiles in eis honorantur." Augustinus, De cat. rud., 26, 50; PL 40, 344. DSC, 36, p. 105: "Ita cum dixit."

Yet, this was the definition upon which he based his sacramental teaching.⁵ It is supported by Augustine's definition from Contra Faustum: all bodily sacraments are nothing else but certain visible words, holy indeed but nevertheless changeable and temporal.⁶ The emphasis is on the sacrament as visible, changeable, temporal. Berengarius is careful to explain what is meant by a visible form of invisible grace: form can only be separated from that which is formed by the intellect. Nor is form visible outside of that which is formed. Rather, the invisible reality is transformed into the visible thing, the visible thing becoming the form of the invisible reality.⁷

Visibility of Sacrament

In his choice of a definition and the application he makes of it,

⁵Bérenger de Tours: jusqu'ici, c'est, à notre connaissance, le premier auteur qui ait employé cette définition . . . jusqu'à Bérenger, il ne semble pas qu'il soit fait usage de cette définition à l'aide du mot 'forma' ou 'signum' . . . il en tire en tout cas parti pour argumenter contre ses adversaires." J. de Ghellinck, "Un chapitre dans l'histoire de la définition des sacrements au XII^e siècle," Mélanges Mandonnet, 2, Paris, 1930, pp. 88-89.

⁶DSC, 26, p. 55: "non sunt aliud quaeque corporalia sacramenta nisi quedam quasi verba visibilia sacrosancta quidem sed tamen mutabilia et temporalia." Augustinus, Contra Faustum, 19, 16; PL 42, 356-357: "Quid enim sunt aliud quaeque corporalia sacramenta, nisi quaedam quasi verba visibilia, sacrosancta quidem verumtamen mutabilia et temporalia? Deus enim aeternus est, nec tamen aqua et omnis illa actio corporalis, quae agitur cum baptizamus, et fit, et transit, aeterna est: ubi rursus etiam illae syllabae celeriter sonantes et transeuntes, cum dicitur, Deus, nisi dicantur, non consecratur." The Augustinian content of Berengarius' definition is discussed by Geiselmann, Die Eucharistielehre, p. 195; and by de Ghellinck, Mélanges, p. 86, n. 1.

⁷DSC, 36, p. 105: "non formam a formato divisam, quod solus facere potest intellectus, visibilem praeter formatum esse constituit, sed rem invisibilem transformatam in rem visibilem, et rem visibilem factam esse formam invisibilis commendavit."

it is obvious that, for Berengarius, an essential characteristic of sacrament is visibility. It is the basis for his insistence on the fact that bread remains after the consecration. To deny the presence of bread is to remove the sacrament or sign, the visible element.

He calls upon the testimony of both Ambrose and Augustine to support his argument. Berengarius claims that Ambrose speaks of bread and wine remaining on the altar after consecration when he says, "You saw the sacraments placed on the altar and wondered at the creature itself."⁸ Berengarius' argument is that Ambrose is certainly speaking of the elements after the consecration, since the bread and wine are not called sacraments until they have been consecrated. They are placed on the altar; they are seen; obviously they are visible. When Ambrose says "You wonder at the creature itself," he is referring to the fact that the new Christians may wonder at the efficacy of the bread which they see, just as Naaman wondered at the healing power of the waters of the Jordan.⁹ Berengarius' conclusion again is that the sacrament is visible bread. This interpretation of Ambrose is strengthened with a further quotation from the same work, in which Ambrose specifically calls the victim offered "this holy bread."¹⁰

⁸DSC, 30, p. 67: "Non minus in eodem de sacramentis libro beatus Ambrosius superesse post consecrationem in altari subjecta panis et vini in Christi corpus conversorum et sanguinem constituit, ubi ait: 'Vidisti sacramenta super altare posita et ipsam miratus es creaturam, creatura tamen sollemnis et nota.'" Ambrosius, De sacr., 4, 3, 8; PL 16, 457A.

⁹DSC, 30, p. 67: "Quod enim dicit: miratus es creaturam, ad eam significationem accipere cogaris, ad quam dicas miratum fuisse Naaman jussisse Eliseum, ut mergeretur in Jordanem."

¹⁰DSC, 30, p. 67: "Habeas nichilominus in eodem de sacramentis libro: 'Offerimus tibi immaculatam hostiam incruentam hostiam hunc panem sanctum.'" Ambrosius, De sacr., 4, 6, 27; PL 16, 464A.

Still relying on Ambrose as his authority, Berengarius insists on the presence of bread as sacrament, although only to be known as sacrament by faith. What is seen with the eyes of the body is corporeal. The eyes do not see something else after the consecration. Berengarius frequently quotes Ambrose's statement: "You saw what are bodily things with the eyes of the body, but the reality of the sacrament you were not able to see with the eyes of the heart."¹¹ He interprets this to mean that the physical elements of bread are not changed or destroyed by consecration, but become sacraments. Bodily eyes see what they had seen before; the eyes of the heart must be enlightened by faith to perceive the sacramental reality. Berengarius drives home his point that the sacrament must be visible, that bread remains on the altar. So, Ambrose says that you have to see what you did not see before, but with the eyes of faith.¹²

To further his argument for the physical presence of bread, Berengarius draws two examples from the writings of Ambrose: the comparison of bread and wine to the waters of baptism; and the significance of the offering made by Melchisedech. He is not concerned here with the invisible reality so much as with the visible form: the physical elements of

¹¹DSC, 30, pp. 68-69: "Et ne perverteres quasi jam non esset visurus in altari panis subjecta sensuality et vini, videbas, inquit beatus Ambrosius in consequentibus, quae corporalia sunt corporalibus oculis, sed quae sacramentorum sunt, cordis oculis videre non poteris."

¹²DSC, 30, p. 69: "Tamquam diceret: Quod dixi: videre habes quae non videbas, noli pervertere ut opineris dixisse me, non superesse post consecrationem quae prius videras panis vinique subjecta. Quod enim dixi: videre habes quae ante non videbas, ad oculos cordis te misi, ad oculos fidei. Quae enim corporalia erant, videbas corporalibus oculis, id est: res quas consecratio altaris non absumit, sed esse sacramenta constituit, i.e. subjecta panis sensuality et vini, sed quae sacramentorum sunt, cordis oculis nisi illuminatus videre non poteris."

bread and wine, which remain unchanged to all appearances and yet become sacraments. According to Berengarius, Ambrose explains the sacrament of the Eucharist as comparable in all things to the sacrament of regeneration. But in baptism, water is converted into a spiritual bath which it was not, not that water ceases to be, but it remains water and is converted into a spiritual bath. It remains physically unchanged and yet is transformed.¹³ The same thing is true of the bread and wine of the Eucharist; therefore, Berengarius tells Lanfranc that he is stubborn and foolish when he contends that the bread on the altar which is converted into the body of Christ does not remain according to the properties of its own nature.¹⁴ Since water remains water in baptism, bread remains bread in the Eucharist. Berengarius was not concerned primarily with establishing the existence of the invisible reality so much as establishing the reality of the visible form.

The example of Melchisedech, according to Berengarius, offers undeniable evidence that bread remains in the sacrament of the altar. Ambrose cannot feel that the properties of bread and wine are destroyed by consecration when he confirms that the sacraments of the Church are older than those of the synagogue.¹⁵ The sacraments of the Jews begin with Moses; those of the Church go back to Abraham. But it was Melchi-

¹³DSC, 29, p. 64: "in spirituale per consecrationem quod non erat aqua convertitur lavacrum, non ut desinat esse aqua, sed ut supersit aqua et in aliud convertatur in spirituale lavacrum quod non erat."

¹⁴DSC, 29, pp. 64-65: "unde panem in altari per consecrationem conversum in Christi corpus, minime secundum proprietatem naturae suae contendas superesse."

¹⁵DSC, 29, p. 65: "Attende ergo quam indissimulabiliter beatus Ambrosius de proprietate panis et vini minime per consecrationem absumpta sentiat, ubi antiquiora ecclesiae quam sinagogae esse confirmat sacramenta." Ambrosius, *De myst.*, 8, 44; *PL* 16, 421A.

sedech who offered the gifts to Abraham; he offered bread and wine. And Berengarius quotes Ambrose as concluding: "What you receive is the sacrament of the divine gifts offered by him who blessed the faithful father Abraham."¹⁶ Thus, says Berengarius, Lanfranc is mad to claim that bread is not received in the Eucharist, but only the flesh of Christ. For, Ambrose clearly states that the Christian people receive what Melchisedech offered to Abraham, which cannot be the flesh of Christ, since that flesh had not yet been born of the Virgin.¹⁷ It is bread which the people receive, the visible element of sacrament.

Therefore, Berengarius challenges the authority of Lanfranc's claim to a sacrament which is invisible. For Augustine, too, asserts that what he calls sacrament is visible, changeable, and temporal.¹⁸ According to Berengarius, it is abundantly clear from his definition of sacrament and of sign. Lanfranc shows himself infinitely stupid to insist in the light of such authoritative evidence that a sacrament can be something "invisibilem, intelligibilem, spiritualem,"¹⁹

¹⁶DSC, 29, p. 65: "Divini igitur muneris est sacramentum quod accipis, ab eo prolatum qui benedixit fidei patri Abrahe."

¹⁷DSC, 29, p. 66: "constat autem panem et vinum Melchisedhec protulisse, carnem vero Christi et sanguinem quae tanto post sibi fabricavit in utero virginis sapientia dei, sensualiter cum nondum essent, proferre minime potuisse Melchisedhec."

¹⁸DSC, 37, p. 108: "nec solum visibile, sed etiam mutabile et temporale esse asserit Augustinus quod sacramentum dicit, quod, i.e. mutabilem et temporalem esse."

¹⁹DSC, 38, p. 110: "quod tu ipse Christi carnem quam confingis sacramentum esse, invisibilem, intelligibilem, spiritualem non dubitas vecorditer affirmare." The strength of Berengarius' accusation against Lanfranc has to be considered in the light of his selective use of texts from Augustine.

Relation of Sacrament to Reality Signified (Res)

Having noted Berengarius' definition of a sacrament as the visible form of invisible grace, with the emphasis on visible as an essential characteristic of sacrament, it is possible to investigate the relationship between the visible sacrament and the invisible reality of which it is the sign.

Berengarius accuses Lanfranc of being confused to the point of contradicting himself on this question.²⁰ For he contends that the visible form of the flesh of Christ is the sacrament; yet in a later passage calls the flesh itself the sacrament. Berengarius interprets this teaching of Lanfranc as madness; to think that bread is destroyed on the altar, that a portion of flesh is visibly present on the altar, that this portion of flesh is a sacrament and yet is invisible.²¹ Here Berengarius is attacking not only the use of sacramentum for an invisible reality, but also the use of what is res in one position as sacramentum of a further reality. He calls it foolishness to speak of a portion of flesh being visibly on the altar and yet invisible; to assert that this portion of flesh is a portion of the body of Christ, that body which is visibly and palpably in heaven.²²

²⁰DSC, 9, p. 14: "in quorum, id est sacramenti et rei cuius est sacramentum consideratione, tibi ipse contrarius existis nec attendis."

²¹DSC, 36, p. 105: "Infinita est enim vecordia, maxime cum tanti Augustinum facias, si putas eum qui ita scripserit, tecum ineptire qui tibi confingis pane absumpto per corruptionem subjecti portiunculam carnis sensualiter adesse in altari, maxime cum tu portiunculam illam carnis et sacramentum esse et invisibilem tamen esse constituas, beatus autem Augustinus indissimulabiliter confirmet, quod sacramentum sit et formam, i.e. sacramentum esse, et visibile esse."

²²DSC, 37, p. 107: "Quanta te vecordia deicis, dum portiunculam carnis, quam sensualiter esse in altari scripsisti et esse invisibilem et eam ipsam tamen esse asseris portiunculam corporis Christi; quod in celo est, quod visibile esse non negas et palpabile."

Such a position is untenable to Berengarius on two counts: 1) a sacrament cannot be invisible; and 2) the same reality cannot be both res and sacramentum.

It is also ridiculous, and unworthy of a learned man, to say, as Lanfranc does, that Berengarius believes the bread and wine to be sacraments only. There can be no such thing as a sacrament without a reality signified. For sacrament implies a relation to reality as son does to father. If there is a son, there is a father; so, if there is a sacrament, there is a reality signified.²³ This is thoroughly in keeping with Augustine's definition of sacrament as the visible form of invisible grace. Therefore, no one can be said to deny flesh and blood who admits the sacraments of flesh and blood.²⁴ Nor, on the other hand, can anyone validly hold that there is nothing present but flesh and blood, since this is to deny the existence of the sacrament. And just as you cannot have a father without a son, so there is no reality signified if there is no sacrament. Berengarius cannot agree with anyone who says that bread and wine are destroyed materially on the altar and still claims that the bread on the altar is the body of Christ.²⁵

The relationship of sacrament to reality as visible sign to invisible reality, established by divine designation, is grounded in likeness and participation. The visible element bears a likeness to the

²³DSC, 26, p. 55: "si sit sacramentum, nulla posse non esse ratione rem quoque sacramenti."

²⁴DSC, 26, p. 55: "Stupendum satis, praesertim in tua eruditione, quod non dubitas scribere me negare carnem et sanguinem, cum concedas dicere me sacramenta carnis et sanguinis."

²⁵DSC, 16, p. 29: "multumque a seipso dissidet, qui dicit panem in altari materialiter absumi et nichilo minus enuntiat; panis et vinum, quae ponuntur in altari, sunt verum Christi corpus et sanguis verumque irrevincibiliter manet, omne quod est."

invisible reality. The reality is manifested in a visible likeness. This likeness is an essential characteristic of the relationship. Bread and wine are the likeness of the body and blood of Christ. According to Augustine, sacraments must bear a likeness to the reality of which they are a sign.²⁶ For Ambrose, too, the sacrament is the likeness of the reality: it is in this likeness that the glory of the true nature is sought.²⁷

It is also true that the visible elements participate in the reality without any change on the part of the reality; the body, of which the sacrament is a likeness, is not a fantasy but the true body of Christ.²⁸ To think of a sacrament is to think of something which is also something other than what it is in itself. In the very act of becoming sacrament, the visible bread thus takes on the reality of the body of Christ.²⁹ At the same time, the body remains whole and entire in heaven.³⁰

²⁶DSC, 41, p. 136: "Porro pro eo quod sacramenta sunt corporis et sanguinis [sic] panis et vinum, etiam similitudo corporis Christi et sanguinis sunt, quia, sicut ait beatus Augustinus ad Bonifacium episcopum: 'si sacramenta rerum quarum sacramenta sunt similitudinem non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent'; non ait secundum vecordiam tuam: 'similitudinem rerum, quae fuerunt', i.e. similitudinem panis et vini, et modo per subjecti corruptionem absumptae sunt, sed ait: 'similitudinem rerum quarum sacramenta sunt'." Augustinus, Ep. ad Bonif., 98, PL 33, 363.

²⁷DSC, 42, p. 141: "ideo, inquam, in similitudinem accipis sacramentum, sed verae naturae gloriam consequeris."

²⁸DSC, 42, p. 142: "ipsum sacramentum similitudo sit verae naturae, i.e. corporis quod non fantasticum, . . . sed verum Christus habuit."

²⁹DSC, 20, p. 41: "panis qui sacramentum non erat, cui facimus per consecrationem, ut cum eo quod est panis, sit etiam sacramentum religionis, est corpus natum de virgine."

³⁰DSC, 42, p. 141: "manet integer totus in caelo." Augustinus, Sermo Mai 129, Misc. Agost., Rome, 1930, p. 1, p. 375.

Relationship supposes distinction. Berengarius insists that the sacrament and the reality signified are distinct according to the witness of Scripture.³¹ The body of Christ is one thing; the sacrament of the body another. One who is not worthy eats the sacrament, but not the body of Christ. So Augustine says that one who does not live in Christ, in whom Christ does not live, does not eat the flesh or drink the blood of Christ even if he daily eats and drinks sacraments of the flesh and the blood.³² It is true that the bread is called the body of Christ; Augustine is again called upon for the explanation of this custom: sacraments are fittingly called by the name of the things of which they are sacraments.³³

This distinction of sacrament and reality signified is attested to by Ambrose as well. Berengarius agrees with Ambrose that one thing is seen on the altar with the eyes of the body, another with the eyes of

³¹DSC, 20, p. 40: "quod dicatur corpus Christi pro eo quod est sacramentum corporis Christi secundum quod apostolus: 'quicumque, inquit, manducaverit panem hunc et biberit calicem pro eo quod est vinum, reus est corporis et sanguinis domini!'"

³²DSC, 20, p. 40: "qui non manet . . . in Christo et in quo non manet Christus procul dubio nec manducat carnem nec bibit sanguinem Christi, etiam si tantae sacramenta rei ad iudicium sibi quotidie manducat et bibit." Augustinus, *In Joan. tr.*, 26, 18; *PL* 35, 1614: "Ac per hoc qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nec manducat carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, sed magis tantae rei Sacramentum ad iudicium sibi manducat et bibit." This does not mean that the sacrament has no reality except for one in faith. It means that the effect of the sacrament cannot be accomplished unless the reality is recognized and accepted.

³³DSC, 20, p. 40: "scripturarum consuetudo, inquit, obtinuit, sacramenta rerum quarum sunt sacramenta nominibus appellari." Augustinus, *Ep. ad Bonif.*, 98; *PL* 33, 363.

the heart.³⁴ The sacrament is a corporal thing, seen with bodily eyes; bread and wine become sacraments through consecration. The reality signified, on the other hand, is seen only by the light of faith.

Jerome gives the example of the lamb as a type of Christ, not to be eaten in parts except in what pertains to the sacrament, but rather to be eaten whole and entire by the heart.³⁵ And Augustine keeps the same distinction: the body is eaten through parts in the sacrament, but remains whole and entire in heaven, whole and entire in the heart.³⁶

Again, Berengarius interprets Augustine as distinguishing what is placed on the altar from the body of Christ. Just as the rock was other than Christ although a sign of Christ, so what is placed on the altar is other than Christ. After consecration, the bread and wine on the altar are the body and blood of Christ not because of the visible sacrament but because of the invisible reality.³⁷ What is placed on

³⁴DSC, 30, p. 69: "Constat auctore Ambrosio aliud super altare corporis, aliud videri oculis cordis; . . . necesse autem habes auctore Ambrosio non negare aliud sacramentorum esse, aliud sacramenta." Ambrosius, *De sac.*, 3, 12: "Considera et tu oculos cordis tui. Videbas quae corporalia sunt corporalibus oculis, sed quae sacramentorum sunt cordis oculis adhuc videre non poteris." The reality there is the same; what differs is the individual recognition of it. It is not a question of no faith, no presence; but of no faith, no realization of presence.

³⁵DSC, 31, p. 77: "Christi corpus totum constat accipi ab interiori homine, fidelium corde, non ore, unde beatus Jeronimus in Ysaia: 'pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus, qui non foris sed in domo una (in unitate ecclesiae) in intus (i.e. in corde) manducatur.'" Hieronymus, *Comm. in Isaiam*, 66, 17; *PL* 24, 692A.

³⁶DSC, 31, p. 77: "per partes manducatur in sacramento, sed manet integer totus in caelo, manet integer totus in corde tuo." Augustine, *Sermo Mai* 129, *Misc. Agost.*, Rome, 1930, P. 1, p. 375.

³⁷DSC, 37, p. 106: "'Judeis petra erat Christus, nobis est Christus, quod in altari ponitur'; ubi si verum insistis, sicut petram aliud

the altar, sacrament, is other than the body of Christ, the reality signified. The distinction is between the material element which is seen and the spiritual reality which is not seen but believed.

Berengarius retains the distinction between the sacrament and the reality signified,³⁸ but not as Lanfranc claims, for this would be to introduce two fleshs of Christ, which is entirely contrary to the reason of faith. For, says Berengarius, Lanfranc contends that an invisible flesh of Christ which is produced by consecration is the figure of the visible flesh of Christ in heaven. Indeed there cannot be two fleshs, but a sacrament, bread, of the reality signified, the body of Christ.³⁹

This distinction leads Berengarius to reject Lanfranc's interpretation of the Emmaus incident in the gospel.⁴⁰ He calls it foolishness to conclude from this episode that Christ is the sacrament of Christ. Such a statement would imply two Christs, one the sacrament of the other.⁴¹

quam Christum fuisse cognoscis, quamvis petra vere fuerit Christus sed in signo, unde ipse beatus Augustinus: 'petra Christus in signo, verus Christus in carne et verbo', ita quod in altari ponitur aliud quam Christum vel carnem Christi esse negare non debetis quantum ad sensualitatem sacramenti, . . . quamvis panis et vinum altaris post consecrationem sint corpus Christi et sanguis quantum ad spiritualitatem vel rem sacramenti." Augustinus, *In Joan. tr.*, 45, 9; *PL* 35, 1723; 26, 12; *PL* 35, 1612.

³⁸*DSC*, 37, p. 106: "unde nulla ratione confingendum tibi fuit, non negare te duo quaedam esse in altari, sacramentum quidem colorem panis, quo coopertam esse confingis portiunculam carnis, rem sacramenti corpus Christi."

³⁹*DSC*, 35, p. 94: "duas inducis Christi carnes contra rationem fidei." *DSC*, 35, p. 95: "Quantum enim ad naturam, panis est quod tu vides oculis corporis, quantum ad divinam benedictionem, ipse panis est corpus Christi quod attendere debes oculis cordis, oculis fidei."

⁴⁰*DSC*, 38, p. 111: "quae vecordia est, Christum pro eo constituere esse sacramentum Christi, cum duos constituere Christos non possis."

⁴¹*DSC*, 38, p. 111: "duo autem esse non negas sacramentum et rem sacramenti."

It is this distinction between visible sign and invisible reality, moreover, which makes it not unworthy of God to be received. For it is the sacrament which is received with the mouth; the reality signified is received with the heart. This is the testimony of Augustine.⁴² The flesh of Christ in sacrament is eaten and is broken; in reality it remains whole and entire in the heart.

Role of Consecration

An essential element in the notion of sacrament is that of consecration. For, a thing is only a sacrament after consecration. Through the words of consecration, the water is changed into a sacrament. So Augustine says that adding a word to the element of water makes it a sacrament and itself a visible word.⁴³ Before consecration the water is a common element; after consecration it is a sacrament. So, too, the bread and wine are made sacraments by the words of consecration. What is received at the altar is bread, but bread which has been raised to the dignity of the body of Christ by the words of consecration.⁴⁴ Yet, the bread does not cease to be bread after the consecration, but it begins

⁴²DSC, 41, p. 133: "quando Christum manducamus, non de illo partes facimus, quod quidem in sacramento fit. Per partes manducatur et manet integer totus. Per partes manducatur in sacramento et manet integer totus in celo, manet integer totus non in ore, non in ventre sed in corde tuo." Augustinus, Sermo Mai 129, Misc. Agost., Rome, 1930, P. 1, p. 375.

⁴³DSC, 32, p. 78: "Unde beatus Augustinus: 'Accedit,* inquit, 'verbum ad elementum aquae et fit sacramentum et ipsum visibile verbum.'" Augustinus, In Joan. tr., 80, 3; PL 35, 1840.

⁴⁴DSC, 21, p. 46: "panis consecratus in altari amisit vilitatem, amisit inefficaciam, non amisit naturae proprietatem, cui naturae quasi loco, quasi fundamento dignitus divinitus augeretur et efficaciam." DSC, 38, 114: "Quod de altari accipis non nego panem esse, sed affirmo non solum, sed de pane per consecrationem in corpus Christi promotum panem esse."

to be the sacrament of the altar.⁴⁵ This consecration cannot be interpreted to be a corruption of the subject of the bread and wine, for unless they remain what they were, they would not be able to be consecrated and to be changed into something else.⁴⁶ Again, the conclusion must be that the bread remains, but bread which through consecration has been established in a new relationship.

Effect of Sacrament

Bread, which was by nature ineffectual for eternal life, becomes effectual by consecration. For no man can attain immortality who profanes the sacraments of the altar.⁴⁷ In the sacrament, there are both bodily species and spiritual fruit. It is necessary to go beyond the bodily species, the sacrament, to what is unseen, the reality, if the sacrament

⁴⁵Berengarius will not accept either annihilation or corruption. In this he agrees with Aquinas: Summa, III, 75. "In the opinion of certain theologians the substance of bread is withdrawn that the body of Christ may be adduced or reproduced, while for the thirteenth century Scholastics it had to be present so as to render possible its conversion into the body of Christ. For some theologians the presence of the substance of bread is an obstacle to the presence of Christ's body. For St. Thomas it is a conditio sine qua non The medieval Scholastics refused to admit any action which would produce a change in Christ's body; transubstantiation changes totally and exclusively the terminus a quo which is the substance of bread, not annihilating it but identifying it with the unchanged body of Christ. For Aquinas the very concept of conversion excludes any annihilation, for it means the passage of one thing into another under some aspect of being. If the terminus a quo of this change is annihilated, there is a passage from being to absolute non-being and therefore, no conversion." Bonano, The concept of substance, p. 206.

⁴⁶DSC, 29, p. 62: "per consecratione, quod nullus interpretari potest per subjecti corruptionem, fieri panem et vinum in sacrificio ecclesiae sacramenta religionis, non ut desinant esse quae fuerant, sed ut sint quae erant, alioquin consecrari non possent, et in aliud commutentur."

⁴⁷DSC, 31, p. 75: "nemo christianus ad immortalitatem redit, si per contemptum profanat sacramenta altaris."

is to be beneficial. Berengarius sets up a parallelism between the effect of food for the physical well-being of man and the Eucharist for his eternal salvation. Just as man eats bread and wine for bodily nourishment, so he partakes interiorly of the flesh and blood of Christ for spiritual sustenance. As the body relaxes in food and drink, so man spiritually rejoices and is refreshed interiorly by participation in the effects of the incarnation and passion.⁴⁸ There is in the sacrament both what one sees with bodily eyes and what one sees with the eyes of the heart, what one eats with the mouth and what one eats in his heart.⁴⁹ Berengarius recalls the prayer of the liturgy that what we take with our mouths may be received with a pure heart.⁵⁰ This spiritual eating is well attested by scripture. In the incident with the Samaritan woman, Christ spoke of having food to eat which no one knew. The food, no doubt, was the conversion of the woman and her people. Such food is eaten by the heart, not by the mouth.⁵¹ Thus, it is clear that, while Berengarius insists

⁴⁸DSC, 39, p. 124: "[Christus] exigit, ut per comestionem et bibitionem corporalem, quae fit per res exteriores, per panem et vinum, commonefacias te spiritualis comestionis et bibitionis, quae fit in mente de Christi carne et sanguine, dum te reficis in interiore tuo, incarnatione verbi et passione, ut secundum humilitatem, per quam verbum caro factum est, et secundum patientiam, per quam sanguinem fudit, interioris tui vitam instituas, quanta debes humilitate, quanta debes emineas patientia, ut in eis tibi adquiescas, in eis tibi adgaudeas, sicut in exteriori tuo in cibis tibi et potibus adquiescis."

⁴⁹DSC, 30, p. 69: "videre habes quae ante non videbas, ad oculos cordis te misi, ad oculos fidei. Quae enim corporalia erant, videbas corporalibus oculis, id est: res quas consecratio altaris non absumit, sed esse sacramenta constituit, i.e. subjecta panis sensuality et vini, sed quae sacramentorum sunt, cordis oculis nisi illuminatus videre non poteris."

⁵⁰DSC, 47, p. 164: "Ut quae ore contingimus, inquit sacerdos, puro corde capiamus. Quam manifesta sacramentorum et rerum distinctio!"

⁵¹DSC, 41, p. 132: "ubi refectionem suam sine dubio conversionem Samaritane et populi ejus accipi voluit cibi nomine, quae profecto corde manducatur, non dente."

that the sacrament is visible, that the bread must remain materially, the true value of the sacrament is the reality which is signified by the consecrated bread. The sacrament is of less value since every sign is less than the reality it signifies. So, too, refreshment of the body by material elements is less than spiritual nourishment by the sacramental reality.⁵² This reality is known by faith only, is actually received only by one who lives in Christ and in whom Christ lives.

Conclusions

At the time of Berengarius, there was not a systematized sacramental theology, nor was there even an established definition of sacrament.⁵³ The controversy which he initiated produced a clarification of doctrine and a precision of terminology unknown to his predecessors.⁵⁴ One of his major contributions was the emphasis on the Augustinian definitions of sacrament as sign.

The word sacramentum had been used from early times to designate the mystery of a divine reality hidden under some sensible rite or

⁵²DSC, 47, p. 163: "praesta ut qui sacramenta accepimus quod minus est, minus est enim signato signum omne, beneficia potiora, sacramentorum res, in homine interiore sumamus, qui per sacramenta quod minus est in corpore reficimur, per res sacramentorum quod potius est mente reficiamur."

⁵³"En effet, jusqu'au milieu du XIII^e siècle, on peut constater un écart régulier entre la notion des sacrements et les formules qui étaient censées les définir. Fruit de généralisations prématurées qui étendent à des groupes entiers ce qui n'a été vérifié que pour quelques cas individuels, les définitions des sacrements se heurteraient dans l'application à des difficultés dont la théologie n'arriva à bout que petit à petit et au prix d'efforts considérables." van den Eynde, Antonianum 24(1949), p. 184.

⁵⁴"Berenger de Tours marque un tournant dans l'histoire des sacrements en général et de leur définition en particulier." Ibid., p. 185.

object.⁵⁵ Many things and ceremonies were called sacrament.⁵⁶ Early Christian writers had distinguished a visible and an invisible aspect in the sacramental actions. It was necessary to understand the signs rather than merely to perceive them with the senses.⁵⁷ So, too, the texts of Ambrose are quite clear in distinguishing the seen from the known.⁵⁸

Augustine was one of the first to attempt a study of the nature of these various phenomena.⁵⁹ He distinguishes the sacrament as one thing; the virtus of the sacrament as another. A thing is called sacrament precisely because in it one thing is seen, another is understood. And Augustine uses both the wider and the narrower meaning of sacrament. He speaks of sacraments in a way which would allow anything to be so called which signified a divine reality.⁶⁰ But he also speaks of the few specific rites which contrast with the many rituals of the old Law.⁶¹ In his works are

⁵⁵"Chez tous ces témoins anténicéens cependant, malgré une multiplicité de sens qui semblerait, à première vue, supprimer toute limite à la plasticité du mot, l'usage tend à se fixer dans deux grandes catégories de significations, celle qui provient du premier sens de serment d'initiation et qui aura pour représentant principal, après une certaine survivance de celle de doctrine religieuse, la notion de rite sacré; puis celle de signe ou de figure, comportant un élément secret ou mystérieux qui requiert explication; l'une et l'autre, finalement, feront converger leur influence dans la définition de nos rites sacramentels; tous les autres sens, mais pour des causes qui ne relèvent pas des seules lois ordinaires de la vie du langage, finiront par disparaître devant cet impérieux rival." de Ghellinck, Pour l'histoire, I, p. 14.

⁵⁶Haring, MedSt 10 (1948), p. 111.

⁵⁷Cf. John Chrysostom, In Matt. hom. 82, 4; Pseudo-Dionysius, De eccl. hierarch. 2, 3, 2; PG 3, 397.

⁵⁸De myst., 8.

⁵⁹"Les sympathies d'Augustin pour le symbolisme et pour l'explication allégorique le prédisposaient, du rest, à l'emploi fréquent du mot sacramentum." de Ghellinck, Pour l'histoire, p. 16.

⁶⁰Ep. 138, 7.

⁶¹Ep. 54, 1.

found various statements relating to one or another aspect of sacrament, but with a stress on the symbolic function of sacrament, on the sacrament as an external sign of a sacred reality.

Yet, the definition which came to be used most frequently was that which Isidore of Seville incorporated in his Etymologies. It was Augustinian, but with the emphasis on mystery. The sacrament was a sign but one which was so because of its utilization in an action which pointed to a further significance: "There is a sacrament in any celebration when the thing performed is so done that it is understood to signify something else which ought to be accepted by one who is holy."⁶²

The difference in emphasis in these considerations of sacrament results in a real divergence of opinion regarding the sacrament of the Eucharist. In both cases, the sacrament would be the consecrated bread and wine. But in the first instance, bread and wine are opposed to the body of Christ as sacrament to reality signified; while in the Isidorian description, there is no clear distinction of the bread and wine from the body of Christ as sacramentum from res: "Whence we call this-- since he commands it--the body and blood of Christ, because, while it may be from the fruits of the earth, it is sanctified and becomes a sacrament with the Spirit of God visibly working."⁶³

⁶²PL 82, 255: "Sacramentum est in aliqua celebratione, cum res gesta ita fit ut aliquid significare intellegatur, quod sancte accipendum est. Sunt autem sacramenta baptismum et chrisma, corpus et sanguis. Quae ob id sacramenta dicuntur, quia sub tegumento corporalium rerum virtus divina secretius salutem eorundem sacramentorum operatur; unde et a secretis virtutibus vel a sacris sacramenta dicuntur."

⁶³PL 82, 255: "Sacrificium dictum quasi sacrum factum, quia prece mystica consecratur in memoriam pro nobis Dominicae passionis; unde hoc eo iubente corpus Christi et sanguinem dicimus. Quod dum sit ex

The definition given by Isidore had been used almost exclusively in sacramental writings. It was the one cited by both Paschasius and Ratramnus in the ninth-century controversy.⁶⁴ They regarded sacrament in the wide sense of any divine action which was done visibly and accomplished an interior saving effect. The term sacramentum was used either because of the secret aspect of the divine activity, or because of the sanctifying action of the Holy Spirit brought about through the use of visible things.⁶⁵

It is interesting to note that Berengarius, in his reaction against an extreme realism that could speak of chewing the body of Christ, seeks out other definitions from the works of Augustine, and nowhere cites the definition of Isidore. He restricts the idea of sacrament to a visible sign, passing over any other Augustinian notions that did not support this particular emphasis. He does not allude to the Augustinian notion of sacrament as enduring. Most probably, Berengarius was not acquainted with the anti-Donatist writings of Augustine which served to develop that

fructibus terrae, sanctificatur et fit sacramentum, operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei; cujus panis et calicis sacramentum Graeci Eucharistian dicunt, quod Latine bona gratia interpretatur. Et quid melius sanguine et corpore Christi?"

⁶⁴Paschasius, PL 120, 1275B; Ratramnus, DCSD, 45-46. "A ce moment, l'étude élémentaire de la Bible, basée sur la grammaire et les autres branches du programme des écoles, avec l'attention donnée aux 'tropi' et aux 'schemata', depuis le fameux capitulaire 'de scolis' de Charlemagne, contribué à renforcer le sens de figure et de symbole, tandis que le sens de rite, appuyé sur la fermeté des institutions ecclésiastiques de l'époque carolingienne, maintient définitivement sa prépondérance," de Ghellinck, Pour l'histoire, p. 18. "Ratramne a voulu maintenir non seulement les termes, mais encore la conception du sacrement, en usage dans l'église des pères et non pas céder aux idées modernes de son temps, idées qui risquent d'inféoder le concept de sacrement aux conceptions philosophiques de la réalité." van den Brink, p. 131.

⁶⁵Paschasius, PL 120, 1275AB.

particular aspect of his sacramentology.

Berengarius thus tended to limit severely the use of a word which had a much wider connotation.⁶⁶ In so doing he lost sight of the mystery element which had been so prominent in sacramental thought.⁶⁷ Throughout the history of Christian worship, the mysteries were the actions which were done, celebrated, offered; at which the people assisted, served, officiated.⁶⁸ Within this action a sacrament operated; it was produced, carried, conserved, distributed, eaten; the people were nourished, fortified, vivified by it. For Berengarius, the idea of sacrament as divine action seems to yield to an exclusive use of sacrament as a visible thing.⁶⁹ In this he contributes to the shift of emphasis away from the Eucharist as an action to the Eucharist as the consecrated elements.

His use of texts, despite his own warning not to interpret an author according to your own heart, is biased toward proving one point, that a sacrament is visible, against Lanfranc who, he says, holds the invisible flesh to be a sacrament. His whole theory centers on the sacrament defined as a material, visible, mutable, temporal element in strict

⁶⁶Haring, MedSt 10 (1948), p. 111.

⁶⁷"Quand on définit le 'mystère', on insiste sur la présence de l'invisible; quand on définit le 'sacrement', on s'attache surtout à ce qui rend présent l'invisible." Beraudy, L'enseignement, p. 93.

⁶⁸"En premier lieu--et c'est l'autre note qui tend à différencier mysterium de sacramentum--un mystère, au sens ancien du mot, est plutôt une action qu'une chose." de Lubac, Corpus, p. 60. Yet, sacramentum was used to designate what we would now call the sacramental character, an invisible reality. Cf. de Ghellinck, Pour l'histoire.

⁶⁹Cf. section on visibility of sacrament, pp. 146-150.

contrast to the reality as spiritual, invisible, immutable, eternal.⁷⁰

Berengarius has no way of uniting these as one being in the light of his philosophy which does not formally differentiate substance and accidents, but things as signs and truth as reality.⁷¹ The frequent comparison of baptismal water and eucharistic bread, the constant reference to Melchisedech's gifts, and to the sacraments which are 'placed on the altar' are aimed at strengthening this point.⁷²

Only by consecration can an existing thing, bread, become a sacrament.⁷³ It is the power of Christ's words which gives to the elements their new reality as sacrament. Christ in first speaking the words of consecration, designated the material element of bread as the visible

⁷⁰Haring, MedSt 10 (1948), p. 110.

⁷¹Cf. Cappuyns, DHGE, 404-405. Cf. pp. 128-130 on substance-accidents.

⁷²"His opposition to what later theologians will call transubstantiation, rests on the assumption that the definition of sacramentum applies in the same manner to Baptism and the Blessed Eucharist." Haring, MedSt 10 (1948), p. 111. "His error did not result from his notion of sacramentum; it resulted from his false analogy which led him to argue that, under the words of consecration, the substance of bread and wine remained as much unchanged as the substance of water." Ibid., p. 144. Berengarius uses the offering of Melchisedech to prove his point of a visible sacrament, particularly of bread remaining as sacrament. He does not retain the deeper meaning of this incident as it had been used in sacramental thought: "Le mystère de l'autel, qui est figuré par l'offrande de Melchisedech, est à son tour en son aspect visible un signe: on pourra donc dire que le pain et le vin du roi de Salem 'sacramenta fuerunt sacramentorum'." de Lubac, Corpus, pp. 57-58.

⁷³DSC, 29, p. 62: "per consecratione, quod nullus interpretari potest per subjecti corruptionem, fieri panem et vinum in sacrificio ecclesiae sacramenta religionis, non ut desinant esse quae fuerant, sed ut sint quae erant, alioquin consecrari non possent, et in aliud commutentur."

form of the reality which is his body. Thus, consecration is an essential element in the notion of sacrament. By it, material bread becomes the visible sign of an unseen reality, the risen body of Christ.⁷⁴

Consecrated bread has an effectiveness beyond its natural ability to nourish, to refresh, to vivify. For those who receive it in faith, it is the body of Christ which provides men with true and eternal life. The visible bread is the pledge and the sign of the spiritual effect.

For Berengarius, a sacrament functions in an order of truth. In its function as sign, it points to the reality signified although it itself is not that true reality. Were it to cease to be itself, it could not function as a sign. His insistence on the visibility of a sacrament makes it impossible for the body of Christ to be present sensualiter. To be manifested visibly by its own proper species belongs to the body of Christ as it is in heaven. On the other hand, the sacrament of Christ's body which the bread is would not be really sacrament if it were not signifying in the Eucharist the reality (res) which is the body of Christ. The relation between sacrament and reality leaves an opening for a true eucharistic presence of the body of Christ.

The investigation of sacramental vocabulary which Berengarius initiates in his specific use of the terms sacramentum and res, and in

⁷⁴In many respects, Berengarius' notions of conversion are similar to Thomas' formulation. Their thought does not seem too contrary, although they are working with different philosophical tools. Cf. Summa, III, 75, 76. DSC, II, p. 17: "Certissimum habete dicere me panem atque vinum altaris post consecrationem Christi esse revera corpus et sanguinem."

his absolute rejection of Lanfranc's use of an intermediate term, will cause many a problem to his successors,⁷⁵ but will bring about the definitions of Peter Lombard.⁷⁶

⁷⁵Alger of Liège tried to maintain the distinction of sacramentum and res, but was troubled by his sources. Part of his trouble came from the fact that he attributed statements of Lanfranc to Augustine and gave them the weight of tradition. Thus he tried to say that the invisible body of Christ is the sacramentum of the visible body, but he was aware of the inconsistency of applying sacramentum to the invisible. In an attempt to solve the dilemma, Alger proposed that some external action is required to justify the use of the term sacramentum in speaking of the invisible body. PL 180, 752; 791. Cf. N. Haring, "A Study in the Sacramentology of Alger of Liège," MedSt 20 (1958), pp. 57-59.

⁷⁶"Enfin, au temps de Pierre Lombard arrive la formule définitive, et, par lui, elle devient classique. L'eucharistie, dit-on désormais, est à la fois un signe sacré (sacrement) et une réalité sacrée. Il y a donc lieu de distinguer en elle ce qui est réalité sacrée sans être signe: sacramentum tantum, sacramentum et res, res tantum. Le sacrement, ce sont les espèces; le sacrement qui est en même temps réalité sainte, c'est le Christ sous les espèces, et enfin, la réalité sainte qui est représentée par le symbolisme des espèces et causée par le corps même du Christ, c'est l'unité de l'Eglise. E. Mersch, Le corps mystique du Christ, Paris, 1951, 1, p. 144.

CHAPTER VI

BERENGARIUS' USE OF THE TERM BODY OF CHRIST (CORPUS CHRISTI)

Berengarius is most emphatic in saying that the bread on the altar is the body of Christ. We have seen that for him the bread is truly bread, though as sacrament it has become something that it was not before. It remains for us to discover what he means by the body of Christ in order to determine the extent to which his concept of body influenced his doctrine of eucharistic presence.

As pointed out in an earlier chapter, one has to be wary of dealing with Berengarius' use of propria locutione and tropica locutione. The fact that he says at times that corpus is used tropica locutione of the Eucharist does not indicate that the body of Christ is not really present, but only that it is not present under its own proper appearances.¹ The first step towards an understanding of Berengarius' use of corpus is to show the distinction between corpus propria locutione and corpus tropica locutione.

Secondly, there is a need to recognize a certain distinction between caro and corpus as the terms are used by Berengarius. It is neither a clear nor a consistent distinction but it does add to the understanding of corpus.

In the third place, certain texts are noted as placing corpus in opposition to panis as res sacramenti to sacramentum. This relationship is the result of consecration whereby corpus is seen as the reality (res) expressed by the sacramentum, bread.

¹Cf. pp. 122ff.

Finally, it is our stated purpose to point out the difficulties that Berengarius' notion of body poses for a doctrine of real presence.

Properly Speaking (propria locutione)

When Berengarius uses the word corpus in its literal sense, when he predicates it properly (propria locutione) of some reality, he always refers to the historical, visible, individual human body of Christ which was born of a virgin, suffered and died, rose from the dead, ascended to heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father. This is the whole body of Christ which the wisdom of God made a thousand years ago.² In the eucharistic scene of the Last Supper, as the Lord spoke of the body which was to be offered and broken, his body itself remained whole.³ This same body suffered, died, and was placed in the tomb. It continues to exist as the same individual body, but with added properties, for the risen body can no longer die.⁴ This human body is no longer subject to any type of corruption; it is restored in impassibility and immortality, admitting no division.⁵

After the resurrection, in fulfillment of prophecy, Christ ascended bodily to a heaven which seems to be, for Berengarius, a localized place;

²DSC, 36, p. 104: "totum corpus Christi quod ante mille annos sibi fabricavit in utero virginis sapientia dei."

³DSC, 41, p. 130: "corpus ipsius adhuc integrum et inattaminatum mansit."

⁴DSC, 27, pp. 43-44: "corpus Christi resurgens a mortuis jam non moritur."

⁵DSC, 27, p. 58: "Cui in sepulcro positae datum est non sentire corruptionem; multo magis a morte in impassibilitatem restituta et in immortalitatem, nullam fractionem, nullam sectionem, nullam attritionem, nullam admittit vel pro parte vel pro toto auctore apostolo Paulo corruptionem."

his body remains at the right hand of the Father until the end of time.⁶ This body, now in heaven, is the body that was born of a virgin and has been existing a thousand years. In his argument against Lanfranc, Berengarius defends that body of Christ which is in heaven,⁷ against the madness of those who claim that the flesh of Christ is on the altar, that the bread is corrupted and the flesh is made through generation.⁸ For Berengarius, there cannot be any question of parts or pieces of this body, since the body of Christ is perfectly incorrupt in the risen state.⁹ Therefore, it is foolishness for anyone to claim that the body of Christ can begin to be, can come into new existence by a process of change in which the bread is destroyed and the body is generated.¹⁰

Berengarius makes quite clear the historical reality of the body of Christ; this body has existed for a thousand years and cannot now begin to be.¹¹ He identifies the body in heaven with the earthly body as

⁶DSC, 37, p. 108: "sessurum esse secundum corpus Christum ad dexteram patris, donec ponantur inimici Christi scabellum pedum Christi, quod quamdiu volvuntur tempora, non desinet fieri."

⁷DSC, 38, pp. 110-111: "corpus illud Christi quod in celo est, quodque per mille jam annos incorruptibiliter existere negare non audes."

⁸DSC, 36, p. 102: "Unde cum sublatō pane per corruptionem subjecti portiunculam carnis nunc factam per generationem subjecti constituis, videndum tibi est necessario non esse corporis Christi, quae nunc primum esse ceperit portiuncula carnis, quia Christi corpus per mille jam annos et pro parte et pro toto insolubiliter extat, insolubiliter extitit."

⁹DSC, 20, pp. 41-42: "quia totum corpus Christi postquam non est datum videre in sepulchro corruptionem, perfecta incorruptione firmatum destrui non potest, . . . quia omni omnino modo impassibilis, incorruptibilis, nichilominus insecabilis."

¹⁰DSC, 20, p. 41: "quia nec pro parte nec pro toto potest incipere nunc esse corpus Christi."

¹¹DSC, 34, p. 87: "Christi corpus per mille jam annos existens, nullo modo nunc esse incipere, nullo modo potest nunc generari."

visible and palpable.¹² And he insists that Christ has but one body, speaking of body in a literal sense.¹³ Further, he maintains that the body can neither be divided, nor exist outside the place of heaven.¹⁴ It seems clear from these texts that the notion of body propria locutione has to do with the body of Christ as it is manifested by its own sensible properties. This refers to the body in what might be called its normal non-sacramental situation.

Yet, this same body of Christ is received by the faithful; just as the whole body of Christ was handed over to death, so the whole and entire body of Christ is received. Problems arise in trying to explain how this can be; it is impossible to receive it with the mouth since the body of Christ remains in heaven until the end of time. The solution is found in a spiritual receiving; the body of Christ is received by the inner man, by the heart, not by the mouth.¹⁵

Figuratively Speaking (tropica locutione)

It is clear that the body of Christ sensibly manifested by its own properties cannot be predicated propria locutione of the bread and

¹²DSC, 36, p. 107: "quod in celo est, quod visibile esse non negas et palpabile."

¹³DSC, 41, p. 137: "constet nonnisi unum corpus, quod propria, non tropica locutione dicatur corpus, habere Christum."

¹⁴DSC, 31, p. 77: "constet Christum corpus unum minime plura habere, illudque, sicut necessario insecabile, quia incorruptibile, ita usque in tempora restitutionis omnium caelo indevocabile permanere."

¹⁵DSC, 31, p. 77: "sicut totum ad mortem corpus Christi non ignoras traditum ita habeas totum integrumque Christi corpus accipi, quod fieri ore corporis cum sit impossibile, quia usque in tempora restitutionis omnium Christi corpus scriptura caelum constituit suscepisse, humana est nichilominus indignum ratione, divina indignissimum majestate, hac per hoc, Christi corpus totum constat accipi ab interiori homine, fidelium corde, non ore."

wine in the Eucharist. Rather since it is known only through the properties of the bread and wine, and even that in faith, it can only be predicated of the bread and wine figuratively (tropica locutione). This is quite different from saying that it has only a figurative existence in the Eucharist. Berengarius states quite clearly that the consecrated bread is the body of Christ.¹⁶ This statement seems to be true because of something which has happened to the bread: it has become a sacrament; the material bread is made a sacrament by consecration.¹⁷ When the bread is made a sacrament of religion, it is then said to be the body born of a virgin.¹⁸ It is visibly bread and truly body.

The bread remains as bread; it is not materially destroyed, but can still be handled--it is placed on the altar.¹⁹ Berengarius brands as madness the statements he attributes to Lanfranc that perceptible bread disappears, and that a particle of the body is sensibly present on the altar. Berengarius holds that the bread is present on the altar after consecration not figuratively but perceptibly, against the contention of Lanfranc that bread is figuratively on the altar. For Berengarius, it is quite clear, what is on the altar after consecration is properly called

¹⁶DSC, 11, p. 17: "Certissimum habete dicere me panem atque vinum altaris post consecrationem Christi esse revera corpus et sanguinem."

¹⁷DSC, 6, p. 7: "sensualem panem consecratione altaris factum sacramentum esse profiteor corpus Christi."

¹⁸DSC, 20, p. 41: "panis qui sacramentum non erat, cui facimus per consecrationem, ut cum eo quod est panis, sit etiam sacramentum religionis, est corpus natum de virgine."

¹⁹DSC, 16, p. 29: "Utrumlibet horum concesseris, panem superesse post consecrationem in mensa dominica, omni procul ambigio concessisti multumque a seipso dissidet, qui dicit panem in altari materialiter absumi et nichilo minus enuntiat: panis et vinum, quae ponuntur in altari, sunt verum Christi corpus et sanguis verumque irrevincibiliter manet, omne quod est."

bread.²⁰ According to Berengarius, this is borne out by the testimony of the Lord himself who blessed bread at the last supper, broke bread, and said of the bread: "Eat this," designating the perceptible bread as his body.²¹ It is obvious to Berengarius that Christ held bread and spoke of bread; it is equally obvious to him that body is predicated of this bread figuratively, that the subject "bread" is to be understood literally; the predicate "body" is to be taken figuratively.²²

Berengarius never denies, but strongly maintains that the bread after consecration is the true body of Christ.²³ But he is vicious in refuting any idea of body being made on the altar; the body of Christ can neither be changed nor divided.²⁴ For him, the body as received in

²⁰DSC, 20, pp. 37-38: "corporis particulam . . . sensualiter . . . panem esse in mensa dominica post consecrationem non tropicum sed sensualem . . . panem esse in mensa dominica sed tropicum, quia ibi esse confirmas portiunculam carnis Christi, quae dicatur tropice panis qui de caelo descendit, . . . panem propria locutione, corpus Christi tropica accipiendum esse."

²¹DSC, 20, p. 38: "in evidenti res erat dominum Christum in cena non pani tropico sed sensuali benedixisse, sensualem panem fregisse, de pane sensuali dixisse: manducate ex hoc, hoc enim, i.e. haec res, i.e. hic panis sensualis est corpus meum."

²²DSC, 20, p. 37: "Item cum dicit dominus de pane illo quem primo in privilegium promovit illud ut esset corpus ipsius, 'hoc' i.e. haec res, hic panis, 'est meum corpus', non est locutus proprie, quia nec panis ille individuus, quem in eam provexerat dignitatem, ut digne sumptus valeret ad animae salutem, susceptibilis erat praedicati individui illius corporis, quod sibi in utero virginis dei sapientia fabricavit et ita subjectus terminus, quod est panis, propria perpendendus est locutione, tropica praedicatus terminus, quod est in propositione meum corpus."

²³DSC, 25, p. 52: "et enuntiare tamen, ut unam earum adhibeam: panis et vinum, quae ponuntur in altari, sunt verum Christi corpus et sanguis, nullus addubitat."

²⁴DSC, 26, p. 56: "Corpus enim Christi cujus sacramentum esse asseris portiunculam recens factam in altari, tibi ipsi contrarius, +++ nulla vecordia tempori obnoxium mutabileque esse vel pro parte vel pro toto affirmare audebis."

the Eucharist is not visible, not temporal, not changeable; these are the characteristics of the sacrament, the bread: the bread is seen, the body is accepted in the visible bread.²⁵

To illustrate the function of the eucharistic bread, Berengarius compares it to the visible bread which nourishes the body of man. Man is composed of body and soul. The soul is refreshed with the spiritual bread of Christ's body; the body of man is nourished with ordinary bread.²⁶ By this spiritual nourishment, man is made holy and given life, for the body of Christ sanctifies and vivifies.²⁷

Berengarius frequently quotes both Ambrose and Augustine to strengthen his points. The consecrated bread is truly the body of Christ, as Ambrose so clearly states: "Before consecration another species is named, after consecration the body is signified . . . before consecration the bread was not the body of Christ, after consecration it is the body of Christ."²⁸ And Augustine is cited to show that

²⁵DSC, 36, p. 101: "te accipere Christi corpus in eo quod aliud vides in pane consecrato quem vides."

²⁶DSC, 27, p. 59: "Homo de duabus substantiis constat, anima et corpore, superiori et inferiori. Superior reficitur Christi corpore ad vitam eternam pane interiore, pane spirituali, inferior ad temporalem pane sensuali, qui tamen post consecrationem est corpus Christi et in eo valet etiam ad vitam eternam fidei. Ita cum constet homo duabus substantiis, anima et corpore, potest qui velit appellare corpus substantiam, animam supersubstantiam, panem sensualem quo reficitur corpus, subsubstantialem, panem spiritualem, i.e. Christi corpus quo reficitur anima, supersubstantialem."

²⁷DSC, 41, p. 129: "Christi corpus enim sanctificat potius atque vivificat."

²⁸DSC, 30, p. 69: "Ante consecrationem alia species nominatur, post consecrationem corpus significatur." Ambrosius, De myst. 9, 54, PL 16, 424B. "panis altaris ante consecrationem non erat corpus Christi, post consecrationem dico tibi quia jam est corpus Christi." Ambrosius, De sacr., 4, 4, 16, PL 16, 461A.

what is received is the one body of Christ: "Accept this in the bread which hung on the cross, drink this in the chalice which flowed from his side."²⁹ Yet this body is different, as Ambrose explains: There is one Christ everywhere, existing fully here and fully there. What is offered everywhere is the one body, not many bodies.³⁰ What is offered is the body of Christ, but in figure. Ambrose says that this offering is the figure of the body and blood of the Lord.³¹ Berengarius interprets this as a necessary manner of presence since Christ now sits at the right hand of the Father. According to Ambrose, there is nothing bloody on the altar, but a saving and life-giving substance in bread and wine.³² This body is not within the usual order of nature, but then, as Ambrose points out, neither is the historical body insofar as it was born of a virgin.³³ The body which is received must be considered spiritually to exist fully

²⁹DSC, 35, p. 94: "Hoc accipe in pane quod pendit in cruce, hoc bibe in calice quod manavit e latere." Augustinus, S. Denis III, PL 46, 827.

³⁰DSC, 30, p. 66: "sed unus ubique est Christus, et hic plenus existens et illic plenus. Sicut enim quod ubique offertur unum corpus est et non multa corpora, ita et unum sacrificium, pontifex autem ille est qui hostiam nos mandantem optulit."

³¹DSC, 35, p. 94: "fac, . . . hanc oblationem ratam rationalem, quod est figura corporis et sanguinis domini." Ambrosius, De sacr., 4, 5, 21, PL 16, 462B.

³²DSC, 35, p. 94: "In ista carne et sanguine nil cruentum, nil corruptibile mens humana concipiat, sed salvatricem vivificatricemque substantiam in pane et vino." Ambrosius, Comm. in Hebr., 5, 6. PL 117, 853-865. Substance does not seem to be used in its technical sense by Ambrose nor by Berengarius. Rather, it is used in the sense of reality with all its life-giving force as present here.

³³DSC, 36, p. 99: "quid hic quaeris naturae ordinem in Christi corpore, cum praeter naturam sit ipse dominus Jesus partus ex virgine?"

in many places at once.³⁴ For a visible body cannot be in many places at once.³⁵

After the discussion here and previous discussions in the study, Berengarius' position seems to be that body can be predicated of the body of Christ propria locutione only as it is in heaven, whereas it can be predicated only tropica locutione of the bread and wine of the Eucharist where Christ's body is not manifested by its own proper appearances. Augustine puts it plainly: The body in which Christ rose must be in one place; his reality however is everywhere.³⁶

Distinction of Flesh (Caro) from Body (Corpus)

This localization of the risen body is linked with the supposition that it is flesh. The same flesh which existed on earth now sits in heaven at the right hand of the Father. Flesh is not something other than

³⁴DSC, 37, p. 109: "Nequaquam, sed unus ubique est Christus, et hic plenus existens et illic plenus, quod, i.e. diversis in locis corpus plenum existere nisi spiritualiter rem fieri concedimus non est intelligere quia non est esse." Ambrosius, Comm. in Hebr., 10, 1-4; PL 117, 888-889.

³⁵DSC, 37, p. 109: "quod diversis in locis eodem momento sensualiter assit corpus, corpus non esse constabit."

³⁶DSC, 44, p. 151: "Donec secundum finiatur, sursum est dominus, sed tamen etiam hic nobiscum est veritas dominus. Corpus enim in quo surrexit uno loco esse oportet, veritas autem ejus ubique diffusa est." Augustinus, In Joan. tr., 30, 1, PL 35, 1632. Thomas will explain the presence of bread and body thus: "the dimensive quantity of Christ's body is in this sacrament, not according to its proper manner . . . but after the manner of substance But in this sacrament the dimensive quantity of the bread is there after its proper manner, . . . the dimensive quantity of Christ's body . . . is there after the manner of substance." Summa, III, 76, 4.

body; it is the body as perceptible.³⁷ It was the manner in which Christ was known to his disciples on earth.³⁸ Christ is not known now on earth according to the flesh since this flesh is in heaven, out of the realm of the senses until the end of time. Augustine traces the history of the flesh of Christ, born of a virgin, nourished, grown to young manhood, hung on a cross by the Jews, buried, raised, and ascended to heaven.³⁹

In its risen state, the flesh of Christ is preserved from the defects of earthly flesh. It continues in existence as the same flesh.⁴⁰ And it cannot be in any way destroyed.⁴¹ Therefore, Berengarius concludes, it is utterly ridiculous for Lanfranc to call the flesh of Christ the sacrament of the body of Christ. A sacrament is visible, temporal, changeable. It is impossible for the flesh of Christ in its present state to be any of these. Berengarius accuses Lanfranc of claiming that the

³⁷DSC, 20, p. 42: "nisi caro haec individua proprium acciperet aliquid per quod eam non lapidem, non panem sed carnem esse oculis corporis appareret, nullo modo vel de nichilo vel de alio aliquo ut esset caro institui potuisset."

³⁸DSC, 9, pp. 13-14: "evangelizat autem apostolus Paulus corporis Christi impassibilitatem praeter alia passim multa, ubi dicit: 'etsi noveramus Christum secundum carnem, sed jam non novimus'."

³⁹DSC, 34, p. 88: "Dominus noster novimus unde acceperit carnem, de virgine infans lactatus est, nutritus est, ad juvenilem aetatem pervenit, a Judeis ligno suspensus est, de ligno depositus est, die tercio resurrexit, quo die voluit ascendit in celum, illuc levavit corpus suum, inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos, ibi est modo sedens ad dexteram patris." Augustinus, Sermo 272, PL 38, 1246.

⁴⁰DSC, 20, p. 41: "caro Christi, quae per mille jam annos tota constat immortalitate nec potest usquequaque nunc incipere esse."

⁴¹DSC, 20, p. 41: "caro illa nec absumi potest, quia immortalis et incorruptibilis est."

very flesh itself is on the altar.⁴² For Berengarius, such a claim destroys the whole idea of the sacrament. If there is nothing but flesh and blood on the altar, it is impossible to say that the consecrated bread is the body of Christ.⁴³ And the flesh of Christ cannot be on the altar because it is now impassible and cannot be cut into parts; nor can it be moved from heaven.⁴⁴

To say that the flesh of Christ as it is is a sacrament is to make it liable to corruption.⁴⁵ This Lanfranc does in stating that it is the flesh of Christ on the altar, retaining some qualities of the bread. Thus the very flesh of Christ itself is made subject to the temporality and change characteristic of these qualities.⁴⁶ To hold such a position is to claim that the flesh itself is broken and chewed.⁴⁷ But this is

⁴²DSC, 9, p. 14: "qui tamen ipse in posterioribus ejusdem tractatus asseris non esse sacramentum colorem vel speciem portiunculae carnis, quae sit post consecrationem in altari, sed ipsam portiunculam, id est non quod in ea subjecta sit sed eam, quae subjectum sit, esse sacramentum totius corporis quod in coelo est Christi eamque ipsam manibus frangi, dentibus atteri."

⁴³DSC, 15, p. 26: "quia qui dicit non esse +++++ post consecrationem nisi carnem sensualiter et sanguinem in altari, ullo modo permittatur dicere: panis altaris post consecrationem est corpus Christi."

⁴⁴DSC, 32, pp. 83-84: "ubi nemo tibi concedet confingere adesse in altari portiunculam carnis, portiunculam sanguinis Christi: primo, quia impassibilis est caro Christi nec ultra per partes desecari poterit; secundo, quia etiam si desecari contingat, impossibile est Christi carnem caelo ante tempora restitutionis omnium demoveri; tercio, quantum ad figmentum tuum, quia etsi possit caro Christi desecta per partes vel integra ad hoc altare in terra positum terrenis oculis expositum deponi ante tempora restitutionis omnium, tu tamen inconcessibile tibi hoc fecisti qui negare persistis carnem Christi et sanguinem quae adesse post consecrationem in sacrificio tu confingis sensualiter videri oculis corporis in altari."

⁴⁵DSC, 21, p. 43: "Christum autem secundum carnem novit, qui eum secundum corpus etiam nunc corruptioni vel generationi obnoxium constituit."

⁴⁶DSC, 21, p. 44.

⁴⁷DSC, 27, p. 58: "et si constituas portiunculam carnis Christi

impossible for the flesh of Christ in its present state.⁴⁸

The flesh of Christ in heaven is visible and palpable;⁴⁹ it cannot be seen on the altar by bodily eyes.⁵⁰ Berengarius denies that Lanfranc can rightly identify the flesh he says is visibly on the altar with the body of Christ in heaven.⁵¹ Thus, Lanfranc is left in the impossible situation of attributing two fleshs to Christ: the one which begins to be on the altar at the words of consecration, and the one which has existed in heaven for a thousand years; an invisible flesh on the altar and a visible flesh in heaven.⁵²

The flesh of Christ is, for Berengarius, the visible, perceptible reality of the body propria locutione, which is at present removed from time and beyond the perception of our bodily senses. Yet it is this very

sensualiter in altari esse, pane qui positus fuerat in altari per corruptionem subjecti absumpto, constituas, necessario cogeris, carnem Christi quantacumque sit si Christi caro est, quae caro Christi vere est panis qui de caelo descendit, nulla frangi, nulla posse ratione atteri."

⁴⁸DSC, 27, p. 58: "Hoc si omni ratione probamus, id est, non posse vulnerari carnem Christi qui resurgens ex mortuis jam non moritur, quod de carne accipiamus necesse est, circa alia enim Christus mortem non sensit, omni necessitate astringimur probare, non manibus frangi, non dentibus atteri carnem Christi."

⁴⁹DSC, 38, p. 110: "visibile atque palpabile."

⁵⁰DSC, 34, p. 90: "corporalibus oculis."

⁵¹DSC, 38, p. 112: "idem autem esse numero carnem quam in altari manu tenes, dente atteris, secundum figmentum cordis tui, et corpus quod in celo est Christi impassibile affirmare non poteris."

⁵²DSC, 38, p. 110: "Infiniti est stuporis quod inducere duas Christi esse carnes non dubitas; hoc autem facis, dum scribis carnem Christi nunc primum factam per generationem subjecti sacramentum esse carnis Christi ante mille et amplius annos existentis, pro eo etiam duas quod tu ipse Christi carnem quam confingis sacramentum esse, invisibilem, intelligibilem, spiritualem non dubitas vecorditer affirmare, corpus autem Christi, quod in celo est, cujus corporis carnem hanc quam adesse scribis sensualiter in altari sacramentum esse confingis, non neges esse visibile atque palpabile."

flesh which provides spiritual nourishment for the faithful in the sacrament; this flesh to which Christ gave new meaning. That flesh was made the body of our priest in the womb of the virgin and by him was offered for our salvation.⁵³ In the sacrament, the whole flesh of Christ is received, but spiritually. It is the whole and entire flesh of the Lord which is received for the nourishment of the soul. The flesh however is not called down from heaven but remains in heaven. Such a reception is not accomplished by the bodily mouth.⁵⁴ The sacrament, the bread, is visibly received; the flesh is no less real, but is perceptible only in heaven and is received spiritually by the man of faith.

As the Reality Signified (res sacramenti)

Berengarius never speaks of the sacramentum as body, or of the body as sacramentum. The body is always the res sacramenti. As we have seen, Berengarius keeps a clear distinction. The risen body of Christ in its present state is beyond the realm of the human senses; all 'sensual' contact must come through the sacramentum. What is broken, what is chewed, is not the reality, but the sacrament. Berengarius objects to any possibility of the reality being broken or chewed.⁵⁵ If the sacrament is re-

⁵³DSC, 43, p. 149: "Non enim prius effecta est beatifica caro illa corpus sacerdotis nostri, quam factus est homo ille sacerdos noster in utero virginis, potuitque, si ita salvatori hominum placuisset, caro illa effecta in utero virginis corpus sacerdotis nostri appellari caro sacrificii nostri, quia eam Christus dominus pro salute nostra optulit, etiam si nichil institutum esset aecclesiae de sacramentis altaris."

⁵⁴DSC, 32, p. 83: "nullus fidelium cogitare debeat, se ad refec-tionem animae suae accipere, nisi totam et integram domini dei sui carnem, non autem caelo devocatam sed in caelo manentem, quod ore corporis fieri ratio nulla permittit."

⁵⁵DSC, 9, p. 14: "Contra tuus ille Vercellensis conventus per-suadet ejusdem corporis per manus fractionem, per dentes attricionem et non quod ad sacramentum sed quod ad rem sacramenti pertineat."

tained as the tangible element of contact, then the incorruptibility of the risen body is preserved.⁵⁶

The distinction must be kept between what is seen by bodily eyes and what is not seen, but known. Our senses perceive the visible sacrament, but it is the knowing power of man which perceives the invisible body in the sacrifice of the altar.⁵⁷ There may be a confusion of language, a way of speaking, by which the sacrament of the body is sometimes called the body;⁵⁸ but this is not to be understood literally. The body is the reality, the very flesh and blood which sanctifies the soul.⁵⁹ It is received interiorly, invisibly; the visible sacrament is received exteriorly. The physical action of eating does not as such touch the body of Christ but only that which is a sign of it. To the inner man pertains the refreshment of the body and blood of the Lord. The inner man spiritually receives the body; the exterior man bodily receives the sacrament.⁶⁰ The

⁵⁶DSC, 45, p. 156: "Quod autem non simpliciter, sed cum additamento conjunctim dicitur, in sacramento frangitur, in sacramento accipitur Christi corpus, nichil contra incorruptibilitatem et impassibilitatem corporis Christi intendit."

⁵⁷DSC, 47, pp. 164-165: "Sacrificium tuum de visibili constat et invisibili, sacramento et re sacramenti. Presta ergo ut, dum secundum visibile nostrum quod visibile habet sacrificium tuum sumimus, i.e. sacramentum, etiam invisibili nostro, i.e. cogitatione, sumamus, quod invisibiliter habet altaris sacrificium, i.e. corpus tuum ad adquiescendum nobis in illo ad gratias agendum, quod etsi est visibile, non tamen usque in tempora restitutionis omnium aspectibus redditur hominum."

⁵⁸DSC, 20, p. 40: "quod dicatur corpus Christi pro eo quod est sacramentum corporis Christi."

⁵⁹DSC, 45, p. 158: "Indifferentem enim sentiendum est tam de carne quam de Christi sanguine, quae sunt res sacramentorum altaris, animam saccari."

⁶⁰DSC, 45, p. 157: "ad interiorem hominem pertinere refectionem fidelium de corpore et sanguine domini dei sui et spiritualiter, non corporaliter, excepto quod ad sacramentum pertinet, fieri in homine interiori, solum sacramentum visibile hominem exteriorem ore visibiliter sumere."

sacrament is the means by which we receive the body of Christ; the body is the source of eternal salvation. Eternal salvation comes to us if we accept with a pure heart the reality signified--the body of Christ, while we receive bodily the sacrament--the holy bread of the altar.⁶¹ Therefore it is of no value to us to receive the sacrament unless we accept the body. To receive the sacrament visibly is good for us, but of how much value is that unless we also pursue intelligently the things that are of the sacraments?⁶² But in accepting the body, we are interiorly refreshed by eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ; we are renewed in the incarnation and passion of the word; we die with him and in him in order that we may remain living.⁶³ Berengarius does not clarify the relation of the res sacramenti to the sacramentum, but he does quite clearly think of the res sacramenti as being present since he says that the body of Christ, which is the res sacramenti, is received in the sacred bread of the altar. If one asks how the body of Christ is present in the bread of the altar, it seems that all one can say is that it is in sacramento. Perhaps this can be clarified somewhat by discussing its relationship in the process of consecration.

As the Term of Consecration

The body is the reality which is reached by means of the 'sacra-

⁶¹DSC, 45, p. 158: "Salus enim aeterna provenit nobis si corpus Christi, i.e. rem sacramenti, puro corde accipimus, dum corpus Christi in sacramento, i.e. in pane sancto altaris, quod est munus temporale, accipimus."

⁶²DSC, 47, p. 163: "Solemne nobis est instituentem Christo domino altaris sensualiter sacramenta accipere, sed quanti istud nisi etiam quae sacramentorum sunt intelligenter consequimur?"

⁶³DSC, 42, p. 144: "interius qui reficitur rem ipsam, i.e. corpus Christi et sanguinem, sibi ingerat, sibi manducet et bibat, reficiendo se, adquiescendo sibi in incarnatione et passione verbi, moriatur ut supersit vivus."

ment. This relationship is established through consecration whereby the bread and wine are converted into the true body and blood of Christ.⁶⁴ While the bread remains bread, from that which it was before consecration, common bread, it becomes the beatific body of Christ.⁶⁵ It becomes the body of Christ in its present state, the risen body. Thus, Christ as he now is in his humanity enters into communication with men through the sacrament. But this is not possible except through the consecration of the bread, for not without coinciding conversion is the bread consecrated on the altar said to have become the body of Christ.⁶⁶ For it is this action which makes bread a sacrament.⁶⁷ When the blessing is given, the bread becomes the body of Christ. When it is carried to the altar, the bread exists according to its own species; to progress to what it was not, it receives a blessing and is made the body of Christ through consecration.⁶⁸

By nature, it is bread; by blessing, it is the body of Christ.

⁶⁴DSC, 13, p. 21: "panem et vinum per consecrationem converti in altari in verum Christi corpus et sanguinem."

⁶⁵DSC, 21, p. 45: "fit inquam panis quod numquam ante consecrationem fuerat de pane, i.e. de eo quod ante fuerat commune quiddam, beatificum corpus Christi."

⁶⁶DSC, 29, p. 63: "Non enim sine competenti conversione panis in altari consecratus factus dicitur Christi corpus."

⁶⁷DSC, 31, p. 74: "Ego eum ita sensisse indissimulabiliter demonstravi, qui et fideles panem et vinum secundum subjecta sua sensuality + + accipere contestetur de mensa dominica, et ea ipsa nichilominus Christi facta esse per consecrationem altaris corpus et sanguinem, quia sacramenta." Tradition shows the Eucharist as action, with the body as the term of action: "elle est la bénédiction qui fait l'eucharistie, avant de devenir le terme de l'action eucharistique, la bénédiction en quelque sorte solidifiée, c'est-à-dire le pain béni, consacré, 'eucharistie', le 'pain mystique'." de Lubac, Corpus, p. 62.

⁶⁸DSC, 34, p. 87: "Quando ad altare afferuntur, secundum species suas existunt, ut proficiant in aliud quam erant, benedictionem accipiunt, ita corpus Christi et sanguis fiunt per consecrationem altaris."

The mouth receives bread; the heart accepts the body of Christ.⁶⁹ This bread, while formed by nature as bread, is established by blessing as the body of Christ. Thus Berengarius agrees with Ambrose that the bread is truly the body of Christ since there is much more in the bread which exists from the blessing than what exists from nature.⁷⁰ It is not a conversion which can be seen; it is not a usual process of change; it can only be known. Berengarius attempts to explain the change which takes place, comparing it to the unusual birth of Christ. The generation of the human body of Christ did not follow the ordinary pattern of human generation. So, too, the conversion of bread into his body is not the usual type of conversion whereby one thing is corrupted as a new thing is generated. Rather, the bread remains what it was and at the same time, becomes what it was not, the body of Christ. The change is not physical, but intelligible; it cannot be seen but can be known.⁷¹ The sacrament becomes the visible form by which what is now invisible to us

⁶⁹DSC, 35, p. 95: "illud quod videt, i.e. panis consecratione suscepta non est quantum ad consecrationem quod illum natura formavit, i.e. non est panis a benedictione altaris sed corpus Christi, ut, dum ore accipit illud quod videt, quod natura formavit, i.e. panem, si in Christo manet non injuria dicatur corde accipere corpus Christi, quod factus est, sed per consecrationem ipse panis, in quo pluris pendenda sit vis divinae benedictionis, quae panem fecit esse corpus Christi, quam naturae vel artis a qua ut panis esset accepit."

⁷⁰DSC, 35, p. 97: "multoque pluris est in pane sacrificii ecclesiae quod habet a benedictione, quam quod habet a natura, hac per hoc, secundum quod majus in eo est, dico te corpus Christi ab altari accipere."

⁷¹DSC, 36, p. 101: "Sicut enim generatum est corpus Christi praeter notam omnibus consuetudinem generandi, ita panis altaris convertitur in corpus Christi, ut sit panis qui erat, et corpus Christi quod non erat, praeter illam omnibus notam conversionem, secundum quam de eo quod est, instituitur esse quod non erat per corruptionem ipsius quod erat; haec autem conversio panis in corpus Christi intelligibilis est nec omnibus nota."

can be seen and can be known.⁷² The term of consecration is, then, bread, but bread which is truly and primarily the body of Christ. So, Berengarius concludes: I do not deny that what you receive from the altar is bread, but I affirm not only bread, but bread which through consecration has been promoted from bread into the body of Christ.⁷³

Conclusions

The body of Christ is for Berengarius a single reality which is known by men spiritualiter. It exists under its own proper species at the right hand of the Father. It is localized there until the restoration of all things. Risen and glorious, that natural body of Christ has added properties of incorruptibility and immutability. It cannot in any way be divided or changed. Existing in reality, it can in no sense begin to be. There is no possibility of that body being on earth visibly and sensibly in its own proper elements.

The difficulties raised by a localization of the body of Christ are apparent. To spatially situate the body at the right hand of the Father seems to negate the assertion that the Eucharist is the body of Christ. For the Eucharist, too, is spatially situated wherever the consecrated bread and wine are. The one concrete body of Christ cannot be in both places.

Berengarius' idea of the risen body only complicates the

⁷²DSC, 36, p. 105: "sacramentum est invisibilis gratiae visibilis forma, non formam a formato divisam, quod solus facere potest intellectus, visibilem praeter formatum esse constituit, sed rem invisibilem transformatam in rem visibilem, et rem visibilem factam esse formam invisibilis commendavit."

⁷³DSC, 38, p. 114: "Quod de altari accepis non nego panem esse, sed affirmo non solum, sed de pane per consecrationem in corpus Christi promotum panem esse."

situation. For, the body glorified receives properties which make it impossible to multiply or change or divide it in any way. Yet, Berengarius is insistent that it is the true body, verum corpus, which is received in the sacrament.

The sacrament itself is an apparent obstacle to the real presence of the body. For, Berengarius insists that the sacrament is really bread, that bread remains on the altar after consecration. If what is seen is really bread, then how can it be said to be the true body of Christ?

The resolution in Berengarius' thought of these apparent conflicts is clarified partially in his explanation of predication. It provides a manner of distinguishing the body of Christ in heaven from the body of Christ in the sacrament without separating it into two bodies. Of that which is in heaven, the historical body of Christ risen in glory and manifested by its own proper appearances, the term "body" can be predicated propria locutione. But since the appearances proper to the sacrament, bread and wine, are not those proper to a body, the term "body" can be predicated only figuratively (tropica locutione) of the sacrament. This is not to deny a real presence of the body but to assert that in the sacrament, body is not manifested according to its own proper appearances.

Furthermore, since the bread of the sacrament retains its own proper appearances, it cannot be possible to predicate the term "bread" of the sacrament tropica locutione. Berengarius accuses Lanfranc of doing so and consistently denounces him for it. The sacrament is bread propria locutione, as Berengarius asserts over and over again. In fact, it is the main point of his entire treatise.

For Berengarius, then, the sacrament is bread propria locutione;

the true body of Christ is predicated of the sacrament tropica locutione. The veritas, the body of Christ is predicated propria locutione of Christ as he is at the right hand of the Father; the veritas, the body of Christ is predicated tropica locutione of the sacrament.

How such a presence is brought about, and how the relationship between the sacrament and the body is realized are questions which are dealt with in the next chapter in the discussion of conversion.

Since the body of Christ is not seen according to its own proper appearances in the sacrament, but in the properties of the bread, it cannot be known sensibly. The intellect enlightened by faith and the words of revelation can recognize and accept the body in the sign. Without faith-vision, the body would not be recognized; without faith-response the presence would not be effective.

The Augustinian approach to symbolism inherited by Berengarius allows a reality to be known by species not properly its own, but designated as such. Bread, designated by Christ as the sign of his body, can manifest the reality of that body. Bread takes on the function of the corporal expression of a reality which is itself invisible. There is no question of identity of the bread with the true body of Christ which remains in heaven, but there is a connection of function whereby the visible elements make known the visible body of Christ, which in turn is the means of knowing Christ. Both his theory of knowledge and his idea of localization of matter lead Berengarius to his conclusions concerning the eucharistic body of Christ.

Augustine's idea of body is that of an individual organism of flesh and bone. The risen body is no different except that God produces

some marvelous effects, such as incorruptibility.⁷⁴ But the risen body remains in a particular place in a material heaven. This localization of the body presents a prime obstacle to the doctrine of the real presence.⁷⁵ Augustine is obviously the source of Berengarius' thought.

Berengarius did not pursue Ambrose's idea of a risen body as transfigured flesh which is not carnal except in so far as it had been flesh. The mutatio carnis in spiritum is accomplished by the resurrection.⁷⁶ For Ambrose, Christ rose all spirit, exists in a spiritual state. The eucharistic body is therefore spiritual.⁷⁷ Berengarius seems to have missed this approach, which indeed was all but eclipsed in tradition by the Augustinian ideas.

Berengarius restricted the meaning of sacrament to refer simply to that which does the sensible manifesting; he localized the risen body.

⁷⁴"Chair spirituelle, explique-t-il à mainte reprise, c'est-à-dire avant tout chair soumise à l'esprit dans un esprit soumis à Dieu; chair qui ne gêne plus l'âme en rien et ne la détourne plus de la contemplation." de Lubac, Corpus, p. 147. "Il admirait les 'merveilleux moyens' par lesquels Dieu gardait éternellement de la corruption cette masse de chair et de sang, comme il avait jadis suspendu l'effet destructeur du feu dans la fournaise de Babylone." Ibid., p. 148.

⁷⁵"Ce qui est en tout cas certain, c'est que son augustinisme abrupt en ce qui concerne la localisation du corps glorieux devait le heurter plus que tout autre à la difficulté qui, nous l'avons vu, était déjà celle d'un Florus ou d'un Ratramne, et qui devait être après lui celle d'un Folmar." de Lubac, Corpus, p. 164. "Ils ont le vif sentiment que si l'on assignait au corps ressuscité, comme Augustin semble le faire, un lieu particulier dans un ciel matériel, c'en serait fait de la réalité que cache le mystère. N'est-ce pas là précisément ce qui pousse un Folmar à renouveler, pensent-ils, le blasphème de Bérenger?" Ibid., p. 153.

⁷⁶"Même quand on distinguait ce corps eucharistique du corps siégeant à la droite du Père, on pouvait voir en outre dans sa 'spiritualité' le résultat de la 'mutatio carnis in spiritum' opérée par la résurrection. Or c'était la particulièrement une idée ambrosienne." de Lubac, Corpus, p. 145.

⁷⁷"saint Ambroise, qu'on a pu appeler 'le dernier des Pères grecs avant saint Augustin', avait hérité d'eux, . . . une idée de la transfiguration du corps et de tout l'être." de Lubac, Corpus, p. 146.

The difficulty of the body of Christ being truly in the sacrament therefore seems insoluble. Yet study shows that Berengarius was raising the problem of being in the context of knowing. His view of reality can face such a difficulty without doing violence to the truth of his faith.

As reality (res), the body of Christ is distinct from the sacrament. It is the reality to which the sign points, in which the figure participates, and to which the image has a likeness. This relationship to the visible bread as sign is established by the action of consecration. The body is unchanged, but the bread takes on the reality designated for it by the words of Christ.

Oddly, Berengarius avoids the notion of the Church as the body of Christ.⁷⁸ A few references are made in citing other authors, but they are not developed. The whole tradition from St. Paul through the Fathers and the pre-scholastics identifies the corpus Christi as the Church.⁷⁹ It was the general tendency to use corpus for the Church, and

⁷⁸This is particularly strange in view of the thinking at Chartres: "A la même époque, vers le onzième siècle, on voit se dessiner peu à peu la formule scolastique qui exprimera, en une distinction claire, les rapports assez complexes, notés par saint Augustin, entre les espèces sacramentelles, le corps physique du Christ et son corps mystique. C'est dans l'école de Chartres que le travail semble s'être effectué. Fulbert, son fondateur, esquisse la formule. Ensuite, Alger de Liège, son disciple, la complète en son traité." E. Mersch, Le Corps, p. 142-143.

⁷⁹Cf. de Lubac, Corpus, pp. 14, 23, 32, 33, 34, 85. "C'est, à cette époque, doctrine commune et mise fort en évidence, que l'eucharistie est le sacrement de l'unité ecclésiastique, et que sa raison d'être est de nous incorporer au Christ et les uns aux autres. D'autres points de doctrine concernant ce sacrement, par exemple, la formule exacte de la présence réelle, sont beaucoup moins avancées. Les auteurs hésitent ou diffèrent d'avis sur la meilleure façon d'exprimer le rapport entre le corps historique du Sauveur et les saintes espèces. Mais tous, tant ceux qui accentuent l'aspect spirituel de la présence, que ceux qui en soulignent le réalisme, sont d'accord sur sa relation avec le corps mystique." Mersch, p. 140.

caro for the Eucharist.⁸⁰

It is to be remembered that Berengarius was writing a polemic treatise. His purpose was to emphasize the visibility of the sacrament, and the risen state of the body of Christ in opposition to Lanfranc's statement that invisible flesh is the sacrament of the body of Christ. In this context, it is most probable that not all his ideas concerning the Eucharist emerge. We can draw no conclusions as to his connection of the sacrament of the Eucharist with the Church as corpus Christi.

⁸⁰"Des saint Paul, le mot évoquait en effet, même en contexte eucharistique, une doctrine plus vaste, et dans les cas où il est question à la fois de l'Eucharistie et de l'Eglise et où l'auteur a intérêt à varier la désignation de l'une et de l'autre, on remarque dans la tradition une tendance à réserver corpus pour désigner l'Eglise. Pour l'Eucharistie, n'avait-on pas un autre mot, scripturaire lui aussi, qui se recommandait de saint Jean: caro?" de Lubac, Corpus, p. 52.

CHAPTER VII

BERENGARIUS' DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST

Consecration and Change

At the time of Berengarius, the idea of transubstantiation had not as yet been formally fully developed. As we have seen, philosophical thought was gradually moving from a Platonic framework which emphasized truth to an Aristotelian view of metaphysics. Yet, the emphasis was still strong on approaching being through knowledge. What a thing is was determined in terms of how it is known, what its true meaning is taken to be. Terminology had not been worked out to define the being of a subject. It is only at the end of the century that substantialiter is first used.¹ It will be the end of the next century before the doctrine of transubstantiation is actually formulated. Thus, one cannot properly speak of Berengarius' acceptance or denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation. But it is possible to investigate his notion of the

¹P. Meyvaert, "Béranger de Tours contre Alberic du Mont-Cassin," Revue Bénédictine 70 (1960), pp. 324-332. Cf. J. de Ghellinck, "Le premier emploi du mot 'transubstantiation'," Recherches de Science Religieuse, 2 (1911), pp. 466-469; 570-572; 3 (1912), pp. 255-259. Even when the word comes into use, it does not have the Aristotelian connotations. In the doctrinal tradition of the Church, the word 'substance' is "found at a date prior to the influence of the Aristotelian theory on Eucharistic theology. We find it in anti-Berengarian writings of the eleventh century and in the profession of faith drawn up for Berengarius, and its meaning is simply the reality of the bread or of the body of Christ." C. Davis, "The Theology of Transubstantiation," Sophia 3 (1964), p. 12. For the historical development of philosophical thought, see E. Gilson, History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages, New York, 1955; Being and Some Philosophers, New York, 1952; The Unity of Philosophical Experience, New York, 1937; D. Knowles, The Evolution of Medieval Thought, New York, 1964; J. Leclercq, The Love of Learning and the Desire for God, New York, 1961.

change which takes place when bread becomes the body of Christ, and to study his reaction to some of the other current explanations which help prepare the way for the formal doctrinal statements on transubstantiation. This will be done by seeking in De Sacra Coena passages which indicate the kind of change that takes place; the means by which this change is accomplished, and the results of the change.

Citing Ambrose as his authority, Berengarius lists three kinds of change which are possible in things. One is the corruption of an already existing thing and the generation of a thing which has not formerly existed; another is the merging of two existing things into one; the third is a change in an existing thing which continues to exist.² Berengarius will not accept the first two types of change as possible in regard to the body of Christ, and he accuses Lanfranc of misinterpreting Ambrose if he thinks this is the type of change he posits.³ For there can be no corruption of the subject, bread; it is essential to the notion of sacrament that the bread remain as the visible element. Indeed, all the qualities which the bread had before consecration are still there after consecration.⁴ Nor can there be a generation of the body; the risen body exists indivisible

²DSC, 39, p. 120: "in primo hujus operis sermone de sacramento corporis Christi tractans beatus Ambrosius diversi generis mutationum exempla proposuit. Est enim mutari aliquid per corruptionem subjecti, ut generetur aliud aliquid, qualis virgae in serpentem, serpentis mutatio in virgam fuit; est mutatio in qua quae mutantur superesse contingit, sicut superfuerunt Jordanica fluentia et fluctus Marini."

³DSC, 39, p. 121: "non ut ejusdem mutationis haberentur, videtur Lanfranno sensisse beatum Ambrosium ita mutari panem in corpus Christi, sicut virgam in serpentem vis divina mutavit, quod alicui videri potuisse stupendum nimis fuit, primo quia absurdissimum erat."

⁴DSC, 21, p. 43: "nullae omnino proprietates quas habuit antequam consecratur panis, jam consecrato abesse possint ullo modo convinci."

and incorruptible in heaven and cannot begin to be.⁵ Bread remains what it was and becomes by consecration what it was not; the body remains as it is.⁶ Berengarius is quite convinced that Ambrose did not imply any type of corruption in speaking of change by consecration: "Nothing is clearer according to the authority of blessed Ambrose than the fact that to be consecrated is not the same as to be destroyed according to the corruption of the subject."⁷

Some of the examples which Ambrose used in speaking of change had been interpreted to mean that the same type of change takes place in the bread, that is a change by corruption and generation. Thus, he speaks of the rod of Moses changed into a serpent; the rod is destroyed and the serpent begins to be. Or the wife of Lot is turned into a pillar of salt; the woman ceases to exist and the pillar comes into being. But Berengarius denies the validity of applying a like conversion to the bread. The purpose of the examples of the rod and the woman was not to show the manner of conversion, but to arouse wonder at the divine power which can

⁵DSC, 21, p. 43: "sed absit corpus Christi obnoxium putare corruptioni, corpus Christi vel ex toto vel ex parte etiam nunc secundum subjecti generationem posse incipere."

⁶DSC, 20, p. 39: "ut panis qui consecratus in altari factus est corpus Christi numquam fuerit corpus Christi ante consecrationem altaris, corpus autem Christi, quod in caelo sedet ad dexteram patris, nulla consecratione instituaturs esse panis."

⁷DSC, 32, p. 80: "Nichil manifestius auctore beato Ambrosio quam non esse idem consecrari et secundum subjecti corruptionem absumi."

bring about such changes.⁸ Certain examples are thus given by Ambrose to show the divine power, which because it is capable of destroying and generating is certainly able to change an already existing object. Further, the analogy does not hold in the case of the bread. For, the rod is no longer visible after the conversion; the serpent only begins to be at the time of the change. But the bread remains visible after the conversion; the body is already existing and in no way changes.⁹

It is the third kind of conversion which takes place, by which the bread and wine are converted into the true body and blood of Christ.¹⁰

A true conversion occurs; it is not a mere way of speaking about the bread.

In fact, unless a conversion takes place the bread could not be called the body of Christ.¹¹ The bread and wine remain what they are and at the same

time are changed.¹² Such a change would take place, for instance in a

⁸DSC, 33, p. 86: "nec verum esse poterit quod beato imponis Ambrosio, ad hoc sibi proposuisse de virga et serpente de aquis et sanguine, ut qui sibi objectionem fecerat, panem et vinum altaris ita converti in carnem doceretur et sanguinem, sicut factum est per subjecti corruptionem, ut virga esse desineret et serpens item per subjecti generationem esse inciperet, sed ut qui in conversione illa divinam miraretur potentiam, etsi non ejusdemmodi, quia non de duobus revera sibi coexistentibus, quia minime per corruptionem subjecti rei existentis, minime per generationem subjecti ejus rei quae numquam prius extiterit, addisceret mirari eandem divinam potentiam et in conversione ista."

⁹DSC, 34, pp. 86-87.

¹⁰DSC, 13, p. 21: "panem et vinum per consecrationem converti in altari in verum Christi corpus et sanguinem."

¹¹DSC, 29, p. 63: "Non enim sine competenti conversione panis in altari consecratus factus dicitur Christi corpus."

¹²DSC, 31, p. 74: "Dum enim confirmat libri auctor, per consecrationem panem et vinum fieri Christi corpus et sanguinem, nichilo tamen minus panem sensualiter et vinum accipere fidelem quemque de mensa dominica, sine conversione fieri tale aliquid posse minime cogitat, satisque de conversione secundum quam non desinunt ea, quae convertuntur, esse quae erant sed sunt quae erant et in aliud convertuntur, suam manifestat sententiam."

sinner who becomes a just man; in Saul who is converted and becomes Paul; he did not cease to be what he was, he remained what he was: a rational soul and a man of flesh, and he began to be what he was not: a vessel of glory.¹³

The conversion of bread into the body of Christ is not perceptible to the senses; therefore, it is not readily known by all.¹⁴ Such knowledge requires faith.

The change which takes place in the bread and wine is a real conversion, not by corruption, not by generation, but by consecration.¹⁵ There is no change on the part of the body; it is the bread which begins to be what it was not: the bread was not flesh before consecration; after consecration it is the flesh of Christ. But the process is not one of corruption, since the bread remains materially bread. What is on the altar after consecration is not the flesh which is in heaven but bread which has become the flesh of Christ.¹⁶ The means by which this is accomplished is the action of consecration which puts into effect the

¹³DSC, 31, p. 75: "non ut desisteret esse qui erat, sed ut esset qui erat, ex anima rationali et carne homo, et inciperet esse quod non erat, vas in gloriam."

¹⁴DSC, 36, p. 101: "Sicut enim generatum est corpus Christi praeter notam omnibus consuetudinem generandi, ita panis altaris convertitur in corpus Christi, ut sit panis qui erat, et corpus Christi quod non erat, praeter illam omnibus notam conversionem, secundum quam de eo quod est, instituitur esse quod non erat per corruptionem ipsius quod erat; haec autem conversio panis in corpus Christi intelligibilis est nec omnibus nota."

¹⁵DSC, 36, p. 102: "Haec incipere possunt esse, quod non erant, corpus Christi et sanguis, sed per consecrationem, non per corruptionem panis et vini et generationem corporis Christi et sanguinis, quae constat semel potuisse generari."

¹⁶DSC, 20, p. 41: "sed panis altaris qui numquam caro fuerat ante consecrationem, fit non per corruptionem sui, sed per consecrationem caro Christi, quia non potest non superesse materialiter quod consecratur."

power of the divine word, the divine benediction.¹⁷

The divine power of the blessing in this conversion is not destructive. Berengarius points out that Ambrose speaks of two things in the process of change: nature and blessing. To blessing he gives the greater role; to nature the lesser. But Ambrose does not speak of the destruction of nature, or else it would have neither greater or lesser strength.¹⁸ The action is a consecration.¹⁹ Consecration is an improvement,²⁰ not a loss.²¹ So, the bread loses none of what it is by nature, yet the word of God predominates so that it is the body of Christ.²² But the effect of the divine blessing is not perdeptible to the senses. Bread is what the bodily eyes see; it takes the eye of faith to see the body of

¹⁷DSC, 29, p. 62: "per consecrationem, quod nullus interpretari potest per subjecti corruptionem, fieri panem et vinum in sacrificio ecclesiae sacramenta religionis, non ut desinant esse quae fuerant, sed ut sint quae erant, alioquin consecrari non possent, et in aliud commutentur."

¹⁸DSC, 32, p. 85: "Duo ponit: naturam, benedictionem. Benedictioni tribuit vim majorem, naturae minorem. Non ergo solum quiddam in altari constituit, nec naturam destruit, quae destructa nec majorem, nec minorem habeat vim."

¹⁹DSC, 33, pp. 85-86: "Est ergo vera procul dubio panis et vini per consecrationem altaris conversio in corpus Christi et sanguinem, sed attendendum quod dicitur per consecrationem, quia hic est hujus conversionis modus."

²⁰DSC, 27, p. 57: "omne quod sacretur, necessario in melius provehi." DSC, 46, p. 160: "Quod item gratias agens, calici, i.e. vino quod in calice erat dominus benedicit, non est intelligere, quia non est esse, non provehi in melius omne cui benedicitur."

²¹DSC, 28, p. 61: "impossibile est quod dicitur aliquid consecrari ad id accipi, ad quod dicatur absumi per corruptionem subjecti, amittere sensualiter proprietatem naturae suae, hac per hoc post consecrationem minime secundum proprietatem naturae suae in altari superesse."

²²DSC, 35, p. 95: "panem, non esse quantum ad mensam dominicam, id quod eum natura formavit, i.e. panem, sed corpus Christi quod eum esse instituit divina benedictio sed per consecrationem altaris."

Christ.²³ The common meaning of bread, signified by its visible form, is eclipsed by the meaning given to the consecrated bread by the words of the Lord; therefore it is now the body of Christ.²⁴

It is the power of the divine word which effects this change.²⁵
In fact, the only way in which a sacrament can be made is through consecration.²⁶ It is the word which consecrates the material objects.²⁷ What was common bread becomes holy.²⁸

The action, therefore, in which God accepts and blesses the material gifts of man is the visible means of continuing in the present that action whereby Christ blessed the gifts, giving them as sacraments of his body the power of sharing in the salvation of men.²⁹

Consecration works a two-fold change in the bread and wine: they

²³DSC, 35, p. 95: "Quantum enim ad naturam, panis est quod tu vides oculis corporis, quantum ad divinam benedictionem, ipse panis est corpus Christi quod attendere debes oculis cordis, oculis fidei."

²⁴DSC, 35, p. 97: "multoque pluris est in pane sacrificii ecclesiae quod habet a benedictione, quam quod habet a natura, hac per hoc, secundum quod majus in eo est, dico te corpus Christi ab altari accipere."

²⁵DSC, 36, p. 102: "Sacramentum quod accipis Christi sermone conficitur." Ambrosius, *De myst.*, 9, 52, PL 16, 424A.

²⁶DSC, 37, p. 106: "sacramentum non posse fieri quippiam nisi per consecrationem."

²⁷DSC, 38, p. 114: "Ante verba sacramentorum, i.e. antequam adhiberentur rebus exterioribus panis et vino verba quibus consecrantur."

²⁸DSC, 41, p. 129: "Hac per hoc panem et vinum accipis de mensa dominica non jam sicut ante consecrationem communia, sed sacrosanta, sed verbis celestibus . . . consecrata."

²⁹DSC, 47, p. 163: "quod etiam temporalem hac mutabilem creaturam panem atque vinum, quae de mensa tua secundum corpus accipimus, ad salutem nobis animae valere instituisti." Cf. 45, p. 155; 43, p. 149.

become sacraments, and they become the body and blood of Christ.³⁰ The bread as sacrament is itself and something more; as body of Christ, it has a totally new purpose and effect.³¹

By consecration, the bread gains a new efficacy, that of the very flesh of Christ. Before consecration, it was common bread, ineffective to eternal life; after consecration it is efficacious for salvation.³²

This increased effectiveness is the result of the Lord's action at the last supper where he instituted the sacrament to bring life to men.³³ For it is the will of the Lord that his action come to us through the visible things he so designates; through them Christ sanctifies, vivifies, blesses men.³⁴

Berengarius himself sums up what he means by conversion. The word "changed" is not used simply. For certain things are changed through corruption of the subject into something which they were not, but it is

³⁰DSC, 16, p. 29: "Panis et vinum, quae in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem sunt sacramenta. Item panis et vinum, quae ponuntur in altari, sunt verum Christi corpus et sanguis."

³¹DSC, 25, pp. 52-53: "panem sensualem qui consecratur in altari post consecrationem superesse panem consecratum in mensa dominica non amittere quod erat, sed assumere quod non erat, ut praeter naturalem pastionem, quam reficiendo potest adhibere corpori, sit etiam panis vitae aeternae, i.e. valeat ad reparandam animae vitam aeternam."

³²DSC, 31, p. 75: "Ceterum, mutationi in placatum irati similis erat mutatio panis in corpus Christi, quia inefficax erat panis natura ante consecrationem ad vitam aeternam, post consecrationem efficax, quia sicut ad aeternitatem amissam in Adam nemo proficeret, nisi verbum caro fieret, ita nemo christianus ad immortalitatem redit, si per contemptum profanat sacramenta altaris."

³³DSC, 46, p. 160: "Ante cenam enim Christi domini ad sustentandam solam corporis valuit panis sensualis vitam labilem; ut ad restituendam animae vitam valeret aeternam, instituit in cena dominus, vocans ea quae non sunt tamquam ea quae sunt in parvis non parvus."

³⁴DSC, 46, pp. 161-162: "Sanctificat autem, vivificat, benedicit, i.e. talia haec quamvis corruptibilia et visibilia invisibiliter reddit per quae benedicantur, sanctificentur, vivificentur in aecclesia filii lucis."

very different for something to be changed through consecration of its own subject rather than through corruption of its own subject; however, bread and wine, with all scripture attesting to this, are changed into the flesh and blood of Christ through consecration, and it is agreed that everything which is consecrated, everything which is blessed by God is not destroyed, not taken away, not made to perish, but remains and is necessarily carried into something better than it was.³⁵

Berengarius rejects any process of change in the Eucharist which would involve a corruption or annihilation of the bread. The visible element is essential to the notion of sacrament; the visible bread must remain in order that there be a sacrament. Besides, if the bread ceases to be, there can be no change of conversion in the true sense, for there would be nothing to be converted. It is also obvious from the words and actions of Christ that the bread must remain as the element to which he has given the significance of the redeeming action of his body.

Nor can there be any process of change in which the body as the term of relationship is in any sense said to begin to be. The nature of the risen body totally excludes any such possibility. For, the glorified body is incorruptible; it can neither be divided nor changed; it exists in reality, and cannot be more or less. The relationship which is established by consecration must result from a change in the bread, not

³⁵DSC, 42, p. 140: "Non enim simpliciter dicitur verbum quod est 'converti'. Convertuntur enim quaedam per corruptionem subjecti in aliud quod non erant, sed longe aliud est converti aliquid per sui subjecti consecrationem, quam per sui subjecti corruptionem; panis autem et vinum, attestante hoc omni scriptura, per consecrationem convertuntur in Christi carnem et sanguinem, constatque omne quod consecratur, omne cui a deo benedicatur, non absumi, non auferri, non destrui, sed manere et in melius quam erat necessario provehi; unde ipse beatus Ambrosius de conversione panis et vini mensae dominicae: 'Christi' inquit, 'sermo operatorius est, ut sint quae erant et in aliud commutentur.'" Ambrosius, *De sacr.*, 4, 4, 15, *PL* 16, 460A.

in the body.

Therefore, the change which takes place must be a conversion by which the bread remains what it is in itself and takes on the reality designated to it by Christ as the sign of his body. This type of change cannot be perceived by the senses; it can only be known by the intellect. Nor is it known by all, but only by those who see in the light of faith.

The change takes place by means of the words of consecration. These words were spoken by Christ, designating the reality of this sign. Consecration does not destroy the visible elements; it rather increases their reality so that they are what they were and become what they were not. The effectiveness of the bread is thus immeasurably heightened to include the efficacy of the redeeming action of Christ himself. A real change takes place.

For Berengarius, there is no change of subject, that by which the bread is. Moreover, he rejects completely the idea of accidents remaining as "clothing" for a different subject. Yet, it is not at all incomprehensible to him that a sensible object, which of itself has a certain inner significance, should become the visible sign of expression of the presence of the inner significance of another sensible object. This is accomplished by the divine word which he does not doubt is powerful enough to effect such a conversion.

Bread is designated by Christ to bear the inner significance of his own body. The conversion, then, is not described by Berengarius in terms of a change of substance, but rather as an increase of reality. From bodily nourishment, it becomes spiritual nourishment; besides giving and sustaining earthly life, it now gives and sustains eternal life. It is the body of Christ.

Presence of Bread after Consecration

A question that remains unsettled in the interpretation of Berengarius' eucharistic doctrine is his position on real presence. His critics are divided as to whether he actually affirms or denies it. With Christian teaching at the time of Berengarius, there was no position on a doctrine of real presence as such. The eucharistic presence had always been a central point of belief and practice. But the Church had not officially adverted to it. Moreover, as we have seen, the Eucharist had been regarded as an action of the Church, as one of the mysteries in which all participated. It is one of the results of the Berengarian controversy that emphasis shifts from action to presence.³⁶

Nevertheless it is possible to ascertain from Berengarius' writing some idea of what he considers to be present in the Eucharist and in what way it is present. The text yields evidence that he maintains that the bread remains after consecration; equally strong are his affirmations that the bread after consecration is the body of Christ.

Once again, the apparent contradiction can be resolved in the light of Berengarius' theory of knowledge and of being. For him, the visible bread and the reality of the body can both be present.

Throughout the course of the argument which Berengarius represents in De Sacra Coena, a main point is undoubtedly that the bread remains as sacrament after the consecration. He is refuting the claim of Lanfranc that the bread is essentially changed (essentialiter mutata natura) into the flesh of Christ. Berengarius never tires of reiterating his point,

³⁶"Dans le pensée théologique, le point de vue de l'action cède décidément la place au point de vue de la présence, et la considération des états divers s'efface également devant celle de l'essence ou de la substance identique: 'substantivum verumque corpus', 'carnis et sanguinis vera natura.'" de Lubac, Corpus, p. 239.

even repeating the exact argumentation three or four times.

In the process of consecration, bread becomes a sacrament. But this in no way implies the destruction of the bread.³⁷ The bread is now holy bread; it is now the body of Christ; but it remains bread.³⁸ What is known to the senses, what is here in veritate, is bread.

Berengarius is not denying that there is something more after consecration, but he first establishes the fact that the sensible object remains. The eyes see the external qualities of wine, not of blood. But what is seen by the eyes is no longer only what it appears to be; after consecration it is not only bodily nourishment, but a sacrament of religion.³⁹ The redeeming blood is present not in its visible qualities, in veritate, but in similitudinem. The chalice does not hold the species of blood, but the likeness of blood--wine become the sacrament of the blood.⁴⁰

The bread which remains is indeed different; it is no longer ordinary bread but holy, consecrated bread.⁴¹ The difference is not in the material substance; rather it is in the interior reality and the

³⁷DSC, 15, p. 27: "Dum enim dicitur: panis et vinum sacramenta sunt, minime panis aufertur aut vinum."

³⁸DSC, 16, p. 29: "Dum dicitur panis in altari consecratus vel panis sanctus, panis sacrosanctus, est Christi corpus, omni veritate panis superesse conceditur."

³⁹DSC, 39, p. 122: "non nego te speciem sanguinis minime videre, quia revera vinum est quod vides oculis corporis in calice." Ambrosius, De myst., 3, 8, PL 16, 408A. "vinum quod erat ante consecrationem alimentum refectionis, post consecrationem est non solum alimentum refectionis, sed etiam sacramentum religionis." Augustinus, Contra Faustum 20, 13, PL 42, 379.

⁴⁰DSC, 39, p. 123: "Speciem sanguinis non habet calix, sed habet similitudinem sanguinis, i.e. vinum factum sacramentum ipsius sanguinis."

⁴¹DSC, 41, p. 129: "Hac per hoc panem et vinum accipis de mensa dominica non jam sicut ante consecrationem communia, sed sacrosanta, sed verbis celestibus, quod scribit beatus Ambrosius, consecrata."

effect that can be produced.⁴²

In very fact, the bread must remain on the altar in order to maintain the reality of the body of Christ. That body in its own material substance is beyond the reach of man's senses; the bread become sacrament is, therefore, the visible manifestation of that which the flesh itself manifests. According to Berengarius, we receive visibly what is visibly in the sacrifice, i.e. the sacrament. At the same time, we receive by the knowledge of faith what is invisibly in the sacrifice, i.e. the body of Christ which of itself is visible but not to men until the end of time.⁴³ Thus, for Berengarius, in the very act of receiving the visible bread we are partaking of that same reality which exists visibly at the right hand of the Father. The bread supplies the visible species for the body here on earth since its own visible species are limited to the place of heaven.

Presence of the Body after Consecration

This bread, which must remain bread even to be sacrament, is nevertheless said to be the body of Christ after consecration.⁴⁴ Berengarius maintained this even under oath: "Bread and wine of the altar after consecration are the body and blood of Christ."⁴⁵ It is important

⁴²DSC, 47, p. 162: "tunc autem quod divinum est nobis confert terrena panis atque vinum substantia."

⁴³DSC, 47, pp. 164-165: "Presta ergo ut, dum secundum visibile nostrum quod visibile habet sacrificium tuum sumimus, i.e. sacramentum, etiam invisibili nostro, i.e. cogitatione, sumamus, quod invisibiliter habet altaris sacrificium, i.e. corpus tuum ad adquiescendum nobis in illo ad gratias agendum, quod etsi est visibile, non tamen usque in tempora restitutionis omnium aspectibus redditur hominum."

⁴⁴DSC, 6, p. 7: "sensualem panem consecratione altaris factum sacramentum esse profiteor corpus Christi."

⁴⁵DSC, 11, p. 18: "Scripsi ergo ego ipse, quod jurarem: Panis atque vinum altaris post consecrationem sunt corpus Christi et sanguis."

to remember that, while Berengarius says that the body of Christ in the Eucharist is recognized per similitudinem, i.e. through designated species, it is revera the body of Christ.⁴⁶ It is the very body which was born on earth.⁴⁷ Although the bread and wine remain as material objects which are seen and handled, they have become the true body of Christ.⁴⁸ It is the body of Christ in its entirety which is received by the believer.⁴⁹

Yet, this body of Christ is in no way visible; it cannot be handled materially.⁵⁰ For the risen body of Christ is materially placed in heaven. What is seen on the altar after consecration is material (sensuale) bread and wine; the body and blood of Christ as they are in heaven are not seen.⁵¹ It is impossible that the flesh of Christ come down from heaven before the end of time.⁵² Berengarius calls on the Holy Spirit himself to uphold his claim that the body of Christ on the altar cannot be sensibly perceived in any manner: to hold that the body of Christ is sensualiter on the altar is to contradict the Holy Spirit who

⁴⁶DSC, 11, p. 17: "Certissimum habete dicere me panem atque vinum altaris post consecrationem Christi esse revera corpus et sanguinem."

⁴⁷DSC, 20, p. 41: "panis qui sacramentum non erat, cui facimus per consecrationem, ut cum eo quod est panis, sit etiam sacramentum religionis, est corpus natum de virgine."

⁴⁸DSC, 25, p. 52: "panis et vinum, quae ponuntur in altari, sunt verum Christi corpus et sanguis." DSC, 6, p. 7: "sensualem panem consecratione altaris factum sacramentum esse profiteor corpus Christi."

⁴⁹DSC, 31, p. 77: "totum integrumque Christi corpus accipi Christi corpus totum constat accipi ab interiori homine."

⁵⁰DSC, 27, p. 58: "non manibus frangi, non dentibus atteri carnem Christi."

⁵¹DSC, 32, p. 83: "ita videri in altari oculis corporis post consecrationem, panis subjectum sensuale et vini, non videri autem quae in caelo reposita sunt corpus et sanguinem Christi."

⁵²DSC, 32, p. 84: "impossibile est Christi carnem caelo ante tempora restitutionis omnium demoveri."

says that the body of Christ is seated on the right hand of the Father.⁵³

The bread is the body of Christ, not the body as known to the senses, but the body as known to the intellect by faith. The bread is no longer ordinary bread, which refreshes the body; it is more than that, spiritual bread, the body of Christ, which refreshes the soul.⁵⁴ The body of Christ cannot sensibly be in more than one place. If what is on the altar at the daily celebration of the sacrifice is sensibly the body of Christ, then it would have to be in many places at once. Or else there could only be one priest who was offering the true sensible body of Christ. Either case is impossible. A sensible body that would be in many places at once would not be a body.⁵⁵ And if the true body of Christ is not offered, the whole Church is contradicted, for the Church in every part of the world offers the body of Christ.

Berengarius agrees with Ambrose that, while the Eucharist is offered in many places, there are not many Christs. There is one Christ everywhere. This is not a solution by positing an ubiquitous body of Christ. Berengarius maintains that body as body cannot be in many places. To sensibly multiply the body of Christ is impossible. This does not mean in Berengarian thought that the one body which is in heaven cannot be in the sacrament. This would seem to indicate, rather than an

⁵³DSC, 37, p. 108: "si quis intendat adesse sensualiter in altari totum Christi corpus, contradicit spiritus sanctus per prophetam, qui dicit sessurum esse secundum corpus Christum ad dexteram patris."

⁵⁴DSC, 27, p. 59: "panem sensualem quo reficitur corpus . . . panem spiritualem, i.e. Christi corpus quo reficitur anima."

⁵⁵DSC, 37, p. 109: "quia quod diversis in locis eodem momento sensualiter assit corpus, corpus non esse constabit. . . . diversis in locis corpus plenum existere nisi spiritualiter rem fieri concedimus non est intelligere quia non est esse."

ubiquitous body, a sacramental body, i.e. a body which is the res of a sacramentum. Location in many places is then a property of the sacramentum of which the body is the res. It takes the vision of faith to discern the body of Christ in the visible subjects which are seen.⁵⁶

By consecration, the bread has become the body of Christ. It retains all the sensible reality it had and receives new reality.⁵⁷ This new reality does not cancel out the old, but it predominates to the extent that bread is said to be the body of Christ. The bread of the sacrifice of the Church is more from the blessing than it is from nature. Therefore it is truly called the body of Christ.⁵⁸ It has a new existence: in origin, due to divine blessing; in manner, no longer only the reality which it visibly manifests but now the figure of another reality; in finality, no longer meant only for the refreshment of the body, but primarily for the spiritual refreshment of man by immersing him in the saving action of the incarnation and passion accomplished in the flesh of Christ. It is a reality which can only be known, it cannot be seen.⁵⁹

The visible bread thus brings the action of Christ to men.

⁵⁶DSC, 30, p. 69: "videre habes quae ante non videbas, ad oculos cordis te misi, ad oculos fidei. Quae enim corporalia erant, videbas corporalibus oculis, id est: res quas consecratio altaris non absumit, sed esse sacramenta constituit, i.e. subjecta panis sensuality et vini, sed quae sacramentorum sunt, cordis oculis nisi illuminatus videre non poteris."

⁵⁷DSC, 38, p. 114: "Quod de altari accipis non nego panem esse, sed affirmo non solum, sed de pane per consecrationem in corpus Christi promotum panem esse."

⁵⁸DSC, 35, p. 97: "multoque pluris est in pane sacrificii ecclesiae quod habet a benedictione, quam quod habet a natura, hac per hoc, secundum quod majus in eo est, dico te corpus Christi ab altari accipere."

⁵⁹DSC, 47, p. 164: "etiam invisibili nostro, i.e. cogitatione, sumamus, quod invisibiliter habet altaris sacrificium, i.e. corpus tuum."

This action is not something that can be seen but must be believed and accepted. For in sacraments, you see what can be seen by bodily eyes; you do not see the things which are done and not seen.⁶⁰ In the Eucharist, by receiving the flesh and blood of Christ, although per similitudinem, the faithful accept the redeeming action of that body. They eat the body and drink the blood without the visible horror of the cross and yet the price of redemption is operative.⁶¹

Thus, the reality of the body of Christ is present but not in its own sensible form. Rather, it is present in sacrament. This means the presence of bread in a twofold aspect as to what it is in itself, and what it signifies: bread is present as bread; bread is present as the sacrament of the body of Christ. It also means the presence of what is signified, the reality, the body of Christ.⁶²

Conclusions

It is evident that for Berengarius two things coexist in the Eucharist: bread and wine which clearly exist according to their own species, and the body and blood of Christ which have existed for a thousand years. This is perfectly in accord with his idea of sacrament, in which

⁶⁰DSC, 32, p. 83: "vidisti . . . quae videre potuisti oculis tui corporis, non vidisti illa quae operantur et non videntur."

⁶¹DSC, 42, pp. 144-145: "in similitudinem sacramentum accipis, et quod in prioribus habes, ut nullus horror cruoris sit et precium tamen operetur redemptionis."

⁶²DSC, 36, p. 101: "panis altaris convertitur in corpus Christi, ut sit panis qui erat, et corpus Christi quod non erat."

⁶³DSC, 34, p. 87: "in sacrificio ecclesiae, duo proponuntur panis et vinum, quae manifeste secundum species suas existunt, proponuntur Christi corpus et sanguis, quae jam, ut dixi, per mille annos existiterunt et nunc esse incipere nulla ratione, immo vecordia probantur."

the sacrament of the body is one thing, the body is another. What is present to the senses and can be known sensualiter is bread; the enlightened intellect perceives the inner reality as the body of Christ, which is therefore known spiritualiter.⁶⁴ This bread which is sacrament does not have only the ordinary intelligibility of bread, but the further significance given to it by Christ designating it to be his body.⁶⁵ The action of Christ conferred meaning on his flesh; he offered it for us.⁶⁶ The words of Christ gave this same meaning to the consecrated bread.⁶⁷ Thus

⁶⁴DSC, 34, pp. 88-89: "quod videtur, speciem habet corporalem, quod intelligitur, fructum habet spiritualement." Thomas, too, will speak of the body of Christ as known not properly, but intellectually or spiritually: "The eye is of two kinds, namely the bodily eye properly so-called, and the intellectual eye, so-called by similitude. But Christ's body as it is in this sacrament cannot be seen by any bodily eye. . . . Christ's body is substantially present in this sacrament. But substance, as such, is not visible to the bodily eye, nor does it come under any of the senses, nor under the imagination, but solely under the intellect, whose object is what a thing is. And, therefore, properly speaking, Christ's body, according to the mode of being which it has in this sacrament, is perceptible neither by the sense nor by the imagination, but only by the intellect, which is called the spiritual eye." Summa, III, 76, 7.

⁶⁵DSC, 35, p. 95: "illud quod videt, i.e. panis consecratione suscepta non est quantum ad consecrationem quod illum natura formavit, i.e. non est panis a benedictione altaris sed corpus Christi, ut, dum ore accipit illud quod videt, quod natura formavit, i.e. panem, si in Christo manet non injuria dicatur corde accipere corpus Christi, quod factus est, sed per consecrationem ipse panis, in quo pluri pendenda sit vis divinae benedictionis, quae panem fecit esse corpus Christi, quam naturae vel artis a qua ut panis esset accepit."

⁶⁶DSC, 43, p. 149: "quia eam Christus dominus pro salute nostra optulit." "le mode . . . de cette présence sera pareillement commandé par le mode . . . de ces actes." de Lubac, Corpus, p. 87. Berengarius quite clearly seems to see Christ as acting on our behalf through the visible elements of his natural body. To this body he gave special significance beyond its own by offering it for mankind. He then transferred this same special significance of his natural body to the visible elements of bread. What Berengarius seems to be saying is that the sign-value of the visible bread is the same as the sign-value of the visible body in heaven. It receives the reality of the redeeming action of the body of Christ.

⁶⁷DSC, 27, p. 57: "hic panis est meum corpus."

the words of Christ, the divine blessing of consecration, bring about an increase of reality in the bread and wine which are the body and blood of Christ according to their inner identity. Berengarius identifies the visible, external thing as bread; but he leaves no doubt that the inner, spiritual, knowable reality is the body of Christ.⁶⁸ The bread attains a greater fullness of being, remaining what it was and becoming what it was not.⁶⁹

There remain two things, bread and body, sacrament and the reality signified.⁷⁰ They are perceived by different faculties; the sacrament can be seen, touched, broken, chewed; the reality can only be received by the inner powers of mind and heart.⁷¹ Even though this coexistence was seen by some of his contemporaries as impanation, this charge is unfounded in Berengarius' writings because he clearly speaks of a transformation of the bread.⁷²

⁶⁸DSC, 37, p. 106: "panis et vinum altaris post consecrationem sint corpus Christi et sanguis quantum ad spiritualitatem vel rem sacramenti."

⁶⁹DSC, 39, p. 120: "Post consecrationem, i.e. non absumptus per corruptionem subjecti, sed consecratus, corpus Christi est panis ipse, jam, i.e. quod ante non erat."

⁷⁰DSC, 47, p. 164: "Sacrificium tuum de visibili constat et invisibili, sacramento et re sacramenti."

⁷¹DSC, 41, p. 133: "Ita ergo Christi caro quantum ad sacramentum per partes manducatur, . . . manu frangitur, quantum ad rem sacramenti tota et integra cordi inmanet, corde manducatur."

⁷²Contemporaries of Berengarius thought that his teaching could be interpreted as impanation, whether Berengarius himself held the notion or not. Thus Guitmund of Aversa says that some followers of Berengarius think that the body and blood of Christ are truly present in such a way that they are impanated: "revera sed latenter contineri, et ut sumi possint quodammodo, ut ita dixerim, impanari." PL 149, 1430D. In Alger of Liège, certain unnamed heretics are said to believe that Christ is impanated in the bread just as God was incarnate in human flesh: "ita personaliter in pane impanatum Christum, sicut in carne humana personaliter incarnatum Deum." PL 180, 754B.

The visible, tangible body of Christ occupies its place at the right hand of the Father in a heaven which from all appearances is material to Berengarius. The reality of that body, with the total meaning Christ had given to his flesh as redeeming mankind, is present on the altar per similitudinem, in species not properly its own. The actual visible body remains in heaven; the designated sacrament of the body is the consecrated bread on the altar. Bread as a sign of the body of Christ means, for Berengarius, the real presence of an actually existing object, the body of Christ.

The redeeming activity which Christ took upon himself as man is present and operative whether manifest in the visible flesh itself or in the visible sacrament. The visible flesh was the means of the saving actions of the incarnation and passion. This presence and action is known to the believer by sensible contact with the visible sacrament on earth. The mode of presence is different, but not the reality present. Just as God has a different way of speaking, not using lungs or mouth or tongue; so the faithful receive the flesh of Christ in a different way, sacramentally.⁷³

Berengarius' concept of the body of Christ as localized in heaven gives a certain meaning to the way in which the body can be present immediately to the senses, but does not affect the reality of the presence, which in any case requires faith; it must be accepted spiritualiter. Those who

⁷³DSC, 41, p. 133: "Sicut autem revera dixit deus, sed quomodo suum est divinitatis incircumscriptione dicere, ita verum est quod scribit beatus Ambrosius, accipere fideles carnem Christi de altari, sed quomodo non indignum sit deo eam accipi, i.e. quantum ad sacramentum ore, quantum ad rem sacramenti corde."

do not believe or who do not know can receive the sacrament, which by consecration is what it was not; they cannot accept the body of Christ, which requires faith to be known as such.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The eucharistic teaching of Berengarius is not a radical innovation in content or method or terminology. From the earliest days of the Church, both realist and symbolist interpretations of the relation of the sign to the reality had been explicitly stated. There was no doubt of the presence of the body of Christ; yet the bread was often called a figure or symbol of the body. In many patristic writings there is a clear distinction between the visible matter and the spiritual reality.

The process by which the eucharistic presence is effected was not discussed with any precision before the time of Berengarius. But there was general agreement, as seen in the writings of the Greek Fathers particularly, that it is a type of conversion, a transformation, a trans-elementation by which the bread and wine are related to the body of Christ.

Berengarius draws heavily upon the ideas of Ambrose for his explanation of the conversion of the bread. He supports it with references to the thought of Augustine. It is just the reverse when he speaks of the notion of sacrament. Then Augustine is the chief source, with Ambrose providing confirmation. The sacrament as sign is the important aspect for Berengarius.

The identity of the eucharistic body in relation to the historical body of Christ had presented a problem in the practical lives of the Christians, as is evident in the attempts of Ambrose and Augustine to clarify the idea in their sermons. One sees, even at this early stage

of doctrinal development, the need for a more precise notion of body in order to understand personal presence. The same problems were brought to the surface of speculative thought by Paschasius and occupied the attention of eucharistic theologians from the ninth century on. Berengarius follows quite closely the teaching of Paschasius' contemporary, Ratramnus of Corbie. He is no different from his own contemporaries in considering the body of Christ as risen and localized in heaven.

In method, Berengarius was hardly more original. His starting point was the truth of faith, to be investigated by the illumined reason. The sources for his knowledge of truth were Scripture, and a limited number of patristic writings. The tools with which he worked were an Augustinian theology, a Platonic philosophy, an Aristotelian logic, and the literary devices of the Roman masters. His profession as a scholar and teacher, together with the growing tendency of his times, may account for the particular format of his work, and the increased emphasis on the dialectical approach. But the method itself is no newer than Augustine, or Erigena, or Ratramnus. And it is a direct response to the work of Lanfranc.

Berengarius' terminology is a reflection of a Platonic theory of knowledge and an Augustinian notion of sacred sign. It needs to be recognized as such in order to be properly understood. Much of the difficulty in interpreting a medieval writer lies in the simple matter of the meaning of words. The vocabulary had been in use for centuries, but the meaning of the words was constantly shifting. So, too, with Berengarius: he used the language of Augustine, of Ambrose, of Ratramnus; but his purpose in writing gave a distinctive coloring to the traditional terms.

The reason for Berengarius' treatise was not to express eucharistic teaching, but to refute what he considered to be false statements of Lanfranc. A total rejection of the presence of a physical, sensible body was one of Berengarius' main objectives. His original quarrel had been with Humbert for allegedly saying that the body of Christ is so real in the Eucharist that it is broken with the hands and chewed with the teeth. The immediate issue is the "utterly ridiculous" claim of Lanfranc that the invisible flesh of Christ present on the altar is the sacrament of the body of Christ in heaven. Argumentation against this position leads to the expression of three distinctly Berengarian ideas: 1) the limitation of a sacramentum to a visible thing distinct from the reality it signifies; 2) the insistence on the presence of visible bread as sign; and 3) the attempt to explain the manner in which the visible sign manifests, expresses, and makes present the body of Christ.

Augustine himself, and tradition before and after him, had never limited the idea of sacramentum to a visible thing. As a matter of fact, the belief of the Church had tended to recognize the mysterion or sacramentum as a divine action among men. The visible aspect was there in order that men might know of God's act. The emphasis was not on a thing to be seen, to be touched; but on the action of God to be received and accepted.

Berengarius brushed aside other characteristics of sacramentum and concentrated on its visibility.¹ With this he intended to completely

¹In quoting liturgical texts, Berengarius does refer to the Eucharist as mystery: DSC, 47, 162: "Celesti misterio, inquit sacerdos in natali domini, pascimur et potamur. Longe aliud dixisse videtur qui dicit pasci et potari fideles corpore Christi et sanguine per misterium quod Christus suos magister celestis instituit."

destroy the position of Lanfranc by which an invisible flesh is placed as an intermediate term between the visible elements of bread and the visible but unattainable body of Christ in heaven.² Berengarius did not accept the distinction which would be formulated in the next century of a res et sacramentum. He seemed to identify as res sacramenti what would now be termed res et sacramentum.³

A visible sacrament could not be identified with the reality it signified.⁴ Berengarius insisted upon the separation of sacramentum and res. One thing signifies; the other is invisible. One thing is subject to change and corruption; the other thing is incorruptible and immutable. A sacrament is visible, tangible, changeable, temporal.

In the Eucharist, the sacramentum is bread. Bread is visible, tangible, changeable, temporal. It is bread that Christ held in his hands and gave to his disciples; it is bread which the priest places on the altar or breaks with his hands. It is bread which is received by the mouth. The visible elements indicate the reality of bread.⁵ Berengarius was

²DSC, 37, p. 107: "Quanta te vecordia deicis, dum portiunculam carnis, quam sensualiter esse in altari scripsisti et esse invisibilem et eam ipsam tamen esse asseris portiunculam corporis Christi; quod in celo est, quod visibile esse non negas et palpabile."

³At least Berengarius did not clearly distinguish between the body of Christ as res, and the ultimate purpose of the sacrament, the res of communion in Christ. Cf. Schillebeeckx, Worship 40 (1966), p. 335.

⁴DSC, 42, p. 142: "Esse enim sacramentum non est ipsum esse, sed aliquid esse."

⁵DSC, 39, p. 120: "Si absumpta putas materialiter per subjecti corruptionem panem et vinum, de quorum mutatione praemisi ut sint, quae erant, absumptum quoque te per subjectum puta de quo dico: vetus creatura eras. Si consecrato per baptismum tibi deest hominis corpus et anima, deerit auctore Ambrosio mensae dominicae post consecrationem panis et vini sensualis materia."

incapable of the later distinction of substance from accidents. He could distinguish the subject from what-is-in-the-subject; that-a-thing-is from that-a-thing-is-something. But this could only be a mental distinction; they could not be separated in fact. He rejects totally any idea of the color of bread "covering" the body of Christ. For him, then, if bread is seen, bread is there. This does not make him a sensist; it merely situates him in an intellectual era prior to the distinctions of Aristotelian metaphysics. Nor does it say that he rejects all but sense knowledge; on the contrary, he bases his whole eucharistic theology on the fact that things signify more than can be sensibly perceived. Berengarius maintains that the visible becomes the form of the invisible so that the same reality is expressed in a different sensible form.⁶ Thus, the bread on the altar is the form of the body of Christ.⁷ The insistence on bread also places Berengarius in direct opposition to the extreme realism which claimed to break and chew the body itself. To his mind, it does not in any sense contradict the belief of the Church that the sacrament is the body of Christ.

Indeed, it seems contradictory to say that the sacrament is bread, and that the sacrament is body. That is to say that bread is body. Berengarius says just that. But he is careful to deny that the statement can be reversed. It is true to say the sacrament is bread; the bread is sacrament; the bread is body; the sacrament is body. It is not true to say the body is sacrament; the body is bread. Bread by consecration becomes

⁶DSC, 36, p. 105: "rem visibilem factam esse formam invisibilis."

⁷DSC, 37, p. 106: "Ea quae sunt in altari panis et vinum, sunt forma corporis et sanguinis."

the body of Christ. The bread is established in a relationship grounded on likeness and participation, and formalized by divine institution, whereby it is known as body.⁸ To say that the sacrament is body is therefore a perfectly true statement. As seen, it is bread; as known, in faith, it is body. According to Berengarius' mentality, a thing is as it is known. Therefore the truth of the sacrament, its reality, is that it is the body of Christ.

The Augustinian theory of sign gives further support to the veracity of the statement that the sacrament is body. A sign in its visible elements indicates its own proper reality, and may also be designated to indicate a reality not properly its own. The eucharistic bread is such a sign. Its visible elements manifest the presence of bread; they are also a figure of the body of Christ since he himself designated them as such.⁹ After

⁸DSC, 42, p. 141: "in similitudinem accipis sacramentum, sed verae naturae gloriam consequeris, id est: ita oportuit a domino institui, ut quod de bibendo praecipit sanguine suo non ad proprietatem quantum ad os et ventrem accipias, sed ad similitudinem, ut sacramentum quod est similitudo, in quo quid jure horreas non sit, ore accipias, ventre excipias, sed tamen verae naturae corporis Christi virtutem, unde ipse dominus: 'qui manducat me, etiam ipse vivit propter me'; quantum ad refectionem cordis in quo tibi in vera verbi incarnatione adquiescas et passione consequeris et gloriam."

⁹Current theology expresses this relationship as one of physical reality to ontological reality: "In the Eucharist we ought to be concerned with an interpersonal relationship between Christ and us, an interpersonal relationship in which Christ gives himself to man by means of bread and wine which, by this very gift, have undergone a transfinalization and an ontological and therefore radical transignification." Schillebeeckx, Worship 40 (1966), p. 337. Cf. Davis, Sophia 3 (1964), p. 21: "Christ alone can make the bread his Body. He does so by the efficacious words of consecration. These do not merely tell us of the change but they bring it about in the real order Christ gives to this same set of physical substances a new meaning, a new purpose, a new function, a new relation to man. By his words, the bread becomes the sign of his active presence."

consecration, the higher significance of the bread is to signify the body of Christ.¹⁰ Therefore, in very truth it can be said that the sacrament is the body of Christ.

Berengarius does not equate body and flesh. Rather, he seems to understand by body the total reality of man as expressed through sensible elements.¹¹ The natural sensible element is the visible flesh. For Christ, this indicates the historical body which was born, suffered and died, rose and now sits at the right hand of the Father.¹² This reality is also expressed through designated sensible elements, the visible bread. Both the natural and the designated sensible elements express the same reality, the body of Christ; the body in the meaning Christ gave to it by offering it for man. In one case, the reality is expressed naturally; in the other, the reality is expressed by sign, or sacramentally.

When Berengarius says that the sacrament is the body of Christ, he is therefore acknowledging the presence of the total reality of Christ as man; the total reality of Christ's saving action. This is very far indeed from the empty symbol he has been accused of proposing.¹³

¹⁰Present day theological thinking seems to be bringing this line of thought to further clarification. Cf. Schillebeeckx, Worship 40 (1966), p. 337.

¹¹DSC, 43, p. 149: "effecta est beatifica caro illa corpus sacerdotis nostri."

¹²DSC, 42, p. 140: "verum dicis non videre te veritatem carnis et sanguinis, i.e. manifeste exposita carnem et sanguinem Christi sed tamen credendum tibi est accipere te de altari carnem et sanguinem Christi, quia sermo Christi potest instituta naturae convertere."

¹³Thomas accuses Berengarius of heresy on this point: "Some men accordingly, not paying heed to these things, have contended that Christ's body and blood are not in this sacrament except as in a sign, a thing to be rejected as heretical, since it is contrary to Christ's words. Hence Berengarius, who had been the first deviser of this heresy, was afterwards forced to withdraw his error, and to acknowledge the truth of the faith."

The difficulty in Berengarius' eucharistic thought arises from his concept of risen body as quantified and therefore localized. He did not see the resurrection as transformation into a spiritual existence, as Ambrose had.¹⁴ He rather followed the Augustinian idea of a body much the same as on earth, but, by the power of God, controlled by the spirit. Indeed, certain qualities are added to the body, so that it is incorruptible and immutable. But the main difficulty is that the body stays "up there." It cannot be here in its own visible elements. The full reality of the body of Christ is present sacramentally; but the body as it is in itself cannot be. For, quantity must always occupy space, and can only occupy one particular space at a time. This notion of risen body as localized is one of the reasons that Christians, then and for centuries, have looked upon Christ as "there." Only a recognition of the risen body as spiritualized will drive home the utter reality of the words, "This is my body."

To say that Berengarius had an adequate explanation of the real presence would be wrong. It is clear that he sees the Eucharist as the body of Christ; he clearly speaks of conversion. Yet, there is a certain inadequacy of explanation as to how this can be. At the root of the problem lies precisely the notion of body.

Berengarius insists, and this is good, on the retention of the sensible aspects of the bread; he legitimately rejects any multiplication

Summa, III, 75, 1. Contemporaries of Berengarius also questioned his symbolism. Adelmann: "ut illorum de te dictis utar, non esse verum corpus Christi neque verum sanguinem, sed figuram quamdam et similitudinem." Heurtevent, p. 288. Cf. Gosechin, PL 143, 900D; Durandus, PL 149, 1393A; 1377A.

¹⁴ Yet, Berengarius had a concept of risen body as outside time: DSC, 47, p. 164: "Christi caro et pro parte et pro toto non mutabilitati, non sit obnoxia temporis."

of the body of Christ. Lacking a precise distinction in his thinking between substance and accidents, he was unable to see clearly a level of being in the bread other than its being a sensible body.

He does not simply juxtapose bread and body. They are not there side by side; bread becomes body. Berengarius limits the notion of sacrament to be bread as sensibly perceptible. He says the term "body of Christ" cannot be predicated propria locutione of the bread as sensibly perceptible, i.e. of the sacrament. The body of Christ is not sensibly present. It is known in faith only in and through the sacramentum. "The bread and wine of the altar after consecration are the body and blood of Christ."

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

A selection of key passages is presented here for the benefit of those who may wish to study the statements of Berengarius more critically.

"Hereticum me habes, quia Christi corpus incorruptibile esse non nescio, quia sensualem panem consecratione altaris factum sacramentum esse profiteor corpus Christi." (DSC, 6, p. 7)

"Panis atque vinum altaris post consecrationem sunt corpus Christi et sanguis." (DSC, 11, p. 18)

"simul etiam esse aliud aliquid minime prohibentur, sunt enim sicut secundum religionem sacramenta, ita secundum aliud alimenta sustentamenta." (DSC, 15, p. 27)

"In evidenti res est non tropice sed proprie proponi panem." (DSC, 20, p. 38)

"de Christi corpore nato de virgine quod propria locutione sed de populo Christi qui et ipse Christi corpus sed tropica locutione dicitur." (DSC, 20, p. 39)

"panis qui sacramentum non erat, cui facimus per consecrationem, ut cum eo quod est panis, sit etiam sacramentum religionis, est corpus natum de virgine." (DSC, 20, p. 41)

"sed panis altaris qui nunquam care fuerat ante consecrationem, fit non per corruptionem sui, sed per consecrationem care Christi, quia non potest non superesse materialiter quod consecratur." (DSC, 20, p. 41)

"fit inquam panis quod nunquam ante consecrationem fuerat de pane, i.e. de eo quod ante fuerat commune quiddam, beatificum corpus Christi." (DSC, 21, p. 45)

"panis consecratus in altari amisit vilitatem, amisit inefficaciam, non amisit naturae proprietatem, cui naturae quasi loco, quasi fundamento dignitas divinitus augeretur et efficacia." (DSC, 21, p. 46)

"Maximi plane cordis est per omnia ad dialecticam confugere, quia confugere ad eam ad rationem est confugere, quo qui non confugit, cum secundum rationem sit factus ad imaginem dei, suum honorem reliquit, nec potest renovari de die in diem ad imaginem dei." (DSC, 23, p. 47)

"panis et vinum, quae ponuntur in altari, sunt verum Christi corpus et sanguis." (DSC, 25, p. 52)

"panem sensualem qui consecratur in altari post consecrationem superesse panem consecratum in mensa dominica non amittere quod erat, sed assumere quod non erat, ut praeter naturalem pastionem, quam reficiendo potest adhibere corpori, sit etiam panis vitae aeternae, i.e. valeat ad reparandam animae vitam aeternam." (DSC, 25, p. 52-3)

"Homo de duabus substantiis constat, anima et corpore, superiori et inferiori. Superior reficitur Christi corpore ad vitam eternam pane interiore, pane spirituali, inferior ad temporalem pane sensuali, qui tamen post consecrationem est corpus Christi et in eo valet etiam ad vitam eternam fidei. Ita cum constet homo duabus substantiis, anima et corpore, potest qui velit appellare corpus subsubstantiam, animam supersubstantiam, panem sensualem quo reficitur corpus, subsubstantialem, panem spiritualem, i.e. Christi corpus quo reficitur anima, supersubstantialem." (DSC, 27, p. 59)

"per consecrationem, quod nullus interpretari potest per subjecti corruptionem, fieri panem et vinum in sacrificio ecclesiae sacramenta religionis, non ut desinant esse quae fuerant, sed ut sint quae erant, aliequin consecrari non possent, et in aliud commutentur." (DSC, 29, p. 62)

"Ceterum, mutationi in placatum irati similis erat mutatio panis in corpus Christi, quia inefficax erat panis natura ante consecrationem ad vitam aeternam, post consecrationem efficax, quia sicut ad aeternitatem amissam in Adam nemo proficeret, nisi verbum caro fieret, ita nemo christianus ad immortalitatem redit, si per contemptum profanat sacramenta altaris." (DSC, 31, p. 75)

"totum integrumque Christi corpus accipi." (DSC, 31, p. 77)

"Christi corpus totum constat accipi ab interiori homine, fidelium corde, non ore." (DSC, 31, p. 77)

"constet Christum corpus unum minime plura habere, illudque, sicut necessario insecabile, quia incorruptibile, ita usque in tempora restitutionis omnium caelo indevecabile permanere." (DSC, 31, p. 77)

"ita videri in altari oculis corporis post consecrationem, panis subjectum sensuale et vini, non videri autem quae in caelo reposita sunt corpus et sanguinem Christi." (DSC, 32, p. 83)

"nullus fidelium cogitare debeat, se ad refectionem animae suae accipere, nisi totam et integram domini dei sui carnem, non autem caelo deuectam sed in caelo manentem, quod ore corporis fieri ratio nulla permittit." (DSC, 32, p. 83)

"Christi corpus per mille jam annos existens, nullo modo nunc esse incipere, nullo modo potest nunc generari." (DSC, 34, p. 87)

"multoque pluris est in pane sacrificii ecclesiae quod habet a benedictione, quam quod habet a natura, hac per hoc, secundum quod majus in eo est, dico te corpus Christi ab altari accipere." (DSC, 35, p. 97)

"Sicut enim generatum est corpus Christi praeter notam omnibus consuetudinem generandi, ita panis altaris convertitur in corpus Christi, ut sit panis qui erat, et corpus Christi quod non erat, praeter illam omnibus notam conversionem, secundum quam de eo quod est, instituitur esse quod non erat per corruptionem ipsius quod erat; haec autem conversio panis in corpus Christi intelligibilis est nec omnibus nota." (DSC, 36, p. 101)

"Christum obtulisse sacrificium totum corpus suum nec aliud sacrificium offerre ecclesiam, sed id ipsum." (DSC, 36, p. 104)

"sacramentum est invisibilis gratiae visibilis forma, non formam a formato divisam, quod solus facere potest intellectus, visibilem praeter formatum esse constituit, sed rem invisibilem transformatam in rem visibilem, et rem visibilem factam esse formam invisibilis commendavit." (DSC, 36, p. 105)

"Ea quae sunt in altari panis et vinum, sunt forma corporis et sanguinis." (DSC, 37, p. 106)

"panis et vinum altaris post consecrationem sint corpus Christi et sanguis quantum ad spiritualitatem vel rem sacramenti." (DSC, 37, p. 106)

"corporis Christi; quod in celo est, quod visibile esse non negas et palpabile." (DSC, 37, p. 107)

"Si absumpta putas materialiter per subjecti corruptionem panem et vinum, de quorum mutatione praemisi ut sint, quae erant, absumptum quoque te per subjectum puta de quo dico: vetus creatura eras. Si consecrato per baptismum tibi deest hominis corpus et anima, deerit auctore Ambrosio mensae dominicae post consecrationem panis et vini sensualis materia." (DSC, 39, p. 120)

"[Christus] exigit, ut per comestionem et bibitionem corporalem, quae fit per res exteriores, per panem et vinum, commonefacias te spiritualis comestionis et bibitionis, quae fit in mente de Christi carne et sanguine, dum te reficis in interiore tuo, incarnatione verbi et passione, ut secundum humilitatem, per quam verbum caro factum est, et secundum patientiam, per quam sanguinem fudit, interioris tui vitam instituas, quanta debes humilitate, quanta debes emineas patientia, ut in eis tibi adquiescas, in eis tibi adgaudeas, sicut in exteriori tuo in cibis tibi et potibus adquiescis." (DSC, 39, p. 124)

"caelestem sermonem in pane et vino operari, sed non ut absumantur et desinant esse quae fuerant, sed ut assumantur in aliud quam erant et incipiant esse per consecrationem corpus Christi et sanguis quae ante consecrationem non fuerant." (DSC, 41, p. 128)

"quae per consecrationem altaris sacramenta fiunt res superesse, sicut illa alia superesse vidisti." (DSC, 41, p. 128)

"Ita ergo Christi caro quantum ad sacramentum per partes manducatur, ut dicit beatus Augustinus, manu frangitur, quantum ad rem sacramenti tota et integra cordi inmanet, corde manducatur." (DSC, 41, p. 133)

"cum constet nennisi unum corpus, quod propria, non tropica lectione dicatur corpus, habere Christum." (DSC, 41, p. 137)

"verum dicis non videre te veritatem carnis et sanguinis, i.e. manifeste exposita carnem et sanguinem Christi sed tamen credendum tibi est accipere te de altari carnem et sanguinem Christi, quia sermo Christi potest instituta naturae convertere." (DSC, 42, p. 140)

"in similitudinem accipis sacramentum, sed verae naturae gloriam consequeris, id est: ita oportuit a domine institui, ut quod de bibendo praecipit sanguine suo non ad proprietatem quantum ad es et ventrem accipias, sed ad similitudinem, ut sacramentum quod est similitudo, in quo quid jure horreas non sit, ore accipias, ventre excipias, sed tamen verae naturae corporis Christi virtutem, unde ipse dominus: 'qui manducat me, etiam ipse vivit propter me'; quantum ad refectionem cordis in quo tibi in vera verbi incarnatione adquiescas et passione consequeris et gloriam." (DSC, 42, p. 141)

"Accipis sacramentum in similitudinem iens, i.e. attendens quod ipsum sacramentum [sic] similitudo sit verae naturae, i.e. corporis quod non fantasticum, quod dicunt Manichei, sed verum Christus habuit." (DSC, 42, p. 142)

"Esse enim sacramentum non est ipsum esse, sed aliquid esse." (DSC, 42, p. 142)

"interius qui reficitur rem ipsam, i.e. corpus Christi et sanguinem, sibi ingerat, sibi manducat et bibat, reficiendo se, adquiescendo sibi in incarnatione et passione verbi, moriatur ut supersit vivus." (DSC, 42, p. 144)

"Non enim prius effecta est beatifica caro illa corpus sacerdotis nostri. quam factus est homo ille sacerdos noster in utero virginis, petuitque, si ita salvatori hominum placuisset, caro illa effecta in utero virginis corpus sacerdotis nostri appellari caro sacrificii nostri, quia eam Christus dominus pro salute nostra optulit, etiam si nichil institutum esset ecclesiae de sacramentis altaris." (DSC, 43, p. 149)

"Est autem veritas Christus." (DSC, 44, p. 153)

"ad interioram hominem pertinere refectionem fidelium de corpore et sanguine domini dei sui et spiritualiter, non corporaliter, excepto quod ad sacramentum pertinet, fieri in homine interiori, solum sacramentum visibile hominem exteriorem ore visibiliter sumere." (DSC, 45, p. 157)

"Indifferentem enim sentiendum est tam de carne quam de Christi sanguine, quae sunt res sacramentorum altaris, animam saccari." (DSC, 45, p. 158)

"Salus enim aeterna provenit nobis si corpus Christi, i.e. rem sacramenti, pure corde accipimus, dum corpus Christi in sacramento, i.e. in pane sancto altaris, quod est munus temporale, accipimus." (DSC, 45, p. 158)

"praesta ut qui sacramenta accepimus quod minus est, minus est enim signato signum omne, beneficia peiora, sacramentorum res, in homine interiore sumamus, qui per sacramenta quod minus est in corpore reficimur, per res sacramentorum quod peius est mente reficiamur." (DSC, 47, p. 163)

"Christi care et pro parte et pro toto non mutabilitati, non sit obnoxia temporis." (DSC, 47, p. 164)

"Sacrificium tuum de visibili constat et invisibili, sacramento et re sacramenti. Presta ergo ut, dum secundum visibile nostrum quod visibile habet sacrificium tuum sumimus, i.e. sacramentum, etiam invisibili nostro, i.e. cogitatione, sumamus, quod invisibiliter habet altaris sacrificium, i.e. corpus tuum ad adquiescendum nobis in illo ad gratias agendum, quod etsi est visibile, non tamen usque in tempora restitutionis omnium aspectibus redditur hominum." (DSC, 47, p. 164-5)

"si praetendit Christus aspectibus humanis panem in altari, quasi ibi sit panis, cum post consecrationem non sit panis omnino sensualiter in altari, si simulat Christus haberi in sacrificio suo panem, cum non sit in eo panis post consecrationem omnino, fallit homines Christus." (DSC, 47, p. 165)

"Qui affirmant auferri per corruptionem subjecti, + consecrantur in sacrificio Christi subjecta panis et vini, contra veritatem locuntur doctrinae propheticae et apostolicae, contra veritatem doctrinae Christi. Qui affirmat corpus Christi vel pro parte vel pro toto manibus sacerdotum tractari super altare, manibus frangi, dentibus atteri, excepto quod ad sacramentum pertinet, contra veritatem loquitur et dignitatem doctrinae Christi. Qui affirmat corpus Christi postquam ad dexteram patris sedit vulnerari non posse vel atteri, excepto quod ad sacramentum pertinet, secundum loquitur et dignitatem doctrinae propheticae et apostolicae (et) domini Jesu. Qui affirmat Christi carnem vel pro parte vel pro toto recens factam per generationem subjecti adesse sensualiter in altari ablato pane per corruptionem subjecti, contra auctoritatem loquuntur aeternae et incommutabilis veritatis." (DSC, 47, p. 166)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Sources

Adelmann of Brescia. De eucharistiae sacramento ad Berengarium epistola. PL 143, 1290-1296.

Alcuin (?). Confessio Fidei. Pars IV: "De corpore et sanguine Domini." PL 101, 1085-1098.

Alger of Liège. De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Domini. PL 180, 739-854.

Ambrose. De mysteriis. PL 16, 389-410.

_____. De sacramentis. PL 16, 417-462.

_____. On the Sacraments and On the Mysteries. Tr. by T. Thompson. Ed. by J. H. Srawley. London, 1950.

_____. Des sacrements. Des mystères. Tr. by B. Botte. Sources Chrétiennes 25. Paris, 1949.

Apostolic Constitutions. PG 1, 555-1155.

Ascelin. Epistola ad Berengarium. PL 150, 67.

Athanasius. Ad Serapionem. PG 26, 525-680.

_____. Ex sermone ad baptizatos. PG 26, 1325.

Augustine. Opera Omnia. PL 32-46.

_____. Miscellanea Agostiniana. Vol. 1. Rome, 1930.

Berengarius Turonensis. De Sacra Coena adversus Lanfrancum. Ed. by W. H. Beekenkamp. Kerkhistorische Studien II. Hague, 1941.

_____. Epistola ad Lanfrancum. PL 150, 63.

_____. Epistola ad Ascelinum. PL 150, 66.

_____. "Berengar betreffende Briefe," in Berengarius Turonensis oder eine Sammlung ihm betreffenden Briefe by H. Sudendorf. Hamburg, 1850.

Benaventure. Liber IV Sententiarum. Florence, 1949.

Clement of Alexandria. Paedagogus. PG 8, 247-684.

_____. Stromata. PG 8, 685-1382; 9, 9-602.

- Cyril of Alexandria. Commentariorum in Matthaeum. PG 72, 365-474.
- Cyril of Jerusalem. Catechesis mystagogica. PG 33, 1059-1128.
- Durand of Troarn. Liber de corpore et sanguine Domini. PL 149, 1375-1424.
- Eusebius Bruno. Epistola ad Berengarium. PL 147, 1199.
- Gottschalk. De corpore et sanguine Domini. PL 112, 1510-1518.
- Gozechin. Epistola ad Valcherum. PL 143, 901.
- Gregory of Nyssa. Oratio catechetica magna. PG 45, 9-106.
- Guitmund of Aversa. De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate in eucharistia libri tres. PL 149, 1427-1494.
- Heriger of Lobbes. De corpore et sanguine Domini. PL 139, 179-188.
- Hugh of Langres. De corpore et sanguine Christi. PL 142, 1325-1334.
- Ignatius of Antioch. Epistle to the Smyrneans. PG 5, 707-718.
- _____. Epistle to the Romans. PG 5, 685-696.
- _____. Epistle to the Ephesians. PG 5, 643-662.
- Irenaeus. Adversus haereses. PG 7, 437-1224.
- Isidore of Seville. Etymologiarum Libri XX. PL 82, 252-260.
- Jerome. Commentar. in epist. ad Titum. PL 26, 603.
- _____. Commentar. in Evangelium Matthaei. PL 26, 202-203.
- _____. Adversus Jovinianum. PL 23, 325.
- John Chrysostom. IN I Cor. hom. PG 61, 11-382.
- _____. In Joannem hom. PG 59, 23-482.
- _____. In Matthaeum hom. PG 57, 13-472.
- Justin. Apologia pro Christianis. PG 6, 327-470.
- Lanfranc. De corpore et sanguine Domini adversus Berengarium Turonensem. PL 150, 407-442.
- Lang, Hugo. S. Aurelii Augustini: Textus Eucharistici Selecti. Florilegium Patristicum 35, Bonn, 1933.
- Migne, J. P. Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca.
- _____. Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina.
- Origen. Commentariorum in Matthaeum. PG 13, 835-1600.

- Paschasius Radbertus. Opera Omnia. PL 120.
- Raban Maur. De institutione clericorum. PL 107, 316-321.
- _____. Penitentieale ad Heribaldum. PL 110, 492-494.
- Ratramnus. De corpore et sanguine Domini. Ed. by J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink. Nieuwe Reeks, Deel LXI, No. 1. Amsterdam, 1954.
- Sootus Erigena, Jeannes. De divisione naturae. PL 122, 439-1023.
- Tertullian. De pudicitia. PL 1, 1029-1082.
- _____. Adversus Marcionem. PL 1, 263-558.
- _____. De monogamia. PL 1, 979-1002.
- _____. De resurrectione carnis. PL 1, 837-934.
- Theodoret. Dialogus 1. Immutabilis. PG 83, 53-56.
- _____. Dialogus 2. Inconfusus. PG 83, 106-220.
- Thomas Aquinas. Summa Theologica. 3 vols. New York, 1947.
- _____. The Eucharistic Presence. Ed. by Wm. Borden. New York, 1965.

II. Works

- Adam, Karl. Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin. Vol. 8 of Forschungen sur Christlichen Literatur und Dogmengeschichte. Paderborn, 1908.
- _____. "Zur Eucharistielehre des heiligen Augustinus," Theologische Quartalschrift 112(1931), 490-536.
- Althaus, H. "Marginalien zu Lessings Wolfenbüttler Berengarforschung," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 72(1961), 336-345.
- Amann, E. L'époque carolingienne. Vol. 6 of Histoire de l'Eglise ed. by A. Fliche and V. Martin. Paris, 1937.
- _____. and A. Gaudel. "Lanfranc," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique 8-1, 2558-2570.
- Arnou, R. "Platonisme des Pères," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique 12-2, 2258-2392.
- Bacilecchi, J. de. "Présence réelle et transsubstantiation," Irenikon 32(1959), 139-161.

- Bareille, G. "Eucharistie d'après les Pères," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique 5, 1121-1183.
- Barth, K. Anselm: Fides Quaerens Intellectum. New York, 1960.
- Bartmann, B. "Zur Sakramentenlehre der Frühscholastik," Theologie und Glaube 9(1917), 450-454.
- Battifol, P. Etudes d'histoire et de théologie positive: l'Eucharistie, la présence réelle et la transubstantiation. Paris, 1930.
- Bauer, B. "Non potest aliter corpus Christi incipere esse de novo in hoc sacramento nisi per conversionem substantiae panis in ipsum," Divus Thomas 37(1934), 120-128.
- Baum, Gregory. "The Manifold Presence of Christ at Mass," The Ecumenist 3(1965), 69-72.
- Beekenkamp, W. H. De Avondmaalsleer van Berengarius van Tours. Kerk-historische Studien I. Hague, 1941.
- Benoit, Pierre. "The Holy Eucharist," Scripture 8(1956), 97-108; 9(1957), 1-14.
- Beraudy, Roger. L'enseignement eucharistique de Ratramne, moine de Corbie, au IX^{ème} siècle dans le De corpore et sanguine Domini; étude sur l'histoire de la théologie eucharistique. Lyon, 1953.
- Benano, S. The concept of substance and the development of eucharistic theology to the thirteenth century. Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology, 2nd series, No. 121-A. Washington, D.C., 1959.
- Botte, B. "Conficere corpus Christi," Année théologique 8(1947), 309-315.
- Bouëssé, Humbert. "La présence du Christ dans l'Eucharistie," Revue Thomiste 56(1956), 620-640.
- Bourassa, F. "Présence 'mystérique' et sacrifice eucharistique," Sciences Ecclésiastiques 10(1958), 23-48.
- Brigüé, L. Alger of Liège, un théologien de l'eucharistie au début du XII^{ème} siècle. Paris, 1936.
- Browe, Peter. Die Verehrung der Eucharistie im Mittelalter. Munich, 1933.
- Brunner, F. "Etudes sur le sens et la structure des systèmes réalistes," Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale X^e-XII^e siècles 1(1958), 295-317.
- Camelet, P. Th. "Réalisme et symbolisme dans la doctrine eucharistique de S. Augustin," Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques 31(1947), 394-410.

- Cappuyens, M. "Béranger de Tours," Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie 8, 385-407.
- _____. Jean Scot Erigène: Sa Vie, Son Oeuvre, Sa Pensée. Louvain, 1933.
- Chem, M.-D. "Grammaire et théologie aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles," Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age 10(1935-1936), 5-28.
- _____. "Naturalisme et théologie au XII^e siècle," Recherches de Science Religieuse 41(1950), 5-21.
- _____. La théologie au deuxième siècle. Etudes de philosophie médiévale, 45. Paris, 1957.
- Chydenius, J. The Theory of Medieval Symbolism. Helsingfors, 1960.
- Clark, F. Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation. London, 1960.
- Clerval, A. Les écoles de Chartres au Moyen Age. Paris, 1895.
- Comeau, M. "Les prédications pascales de saint Augustin," Recherches de Science Religieuse 23(1933), 257-282.
- Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council. Acta Apostolicae Sedis 56(1964). Eng. tr. by Paulist Press, Glen Rock, N.J., 1964.
- Copleston, F. A History of Philosophy. Vol. 2. Mediaeval Philosophy. Westminster, Md., 1962.
- Cornford, F. M. Plato's Theory of Knowledge. London, 1935.
- Couturier, C. "'Sacramentum' et 'mysterium' dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin," Etudes augustiniennes, 161-332. Paris, 1953.
- Cullmann, O. and F. Leenhardt. Essays on the Lord's Supper. London, 1958.
- Daniel-Rops, H. The Church in the Dark Ages. New York, 1962.
- Davis, Charles. "The Theology of Transubstantiation," Sophia 3(1964), 12-24.
- _____. Theology for Today. New York, 1962.
- _____. "Understanding the Real Presence," in The Word in History ed. by T. P. Burke. New York, 1966.
- De Ghellinck, J. "A propos du premier emploi du mot 'transubstantiation'," Recherches de Science Religieuse 2(1911), 466-469; 3(1912), 255-259.
- _____. "Eucharistie au XII^e siècle en Occident," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique 5-2, 1233-1302.

- _____. "Dialectique, théologie, et dogme au X^e-XII^e siècles," Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, 79-99. Munster, 1913.
- _____. "Un chapitre dans l'histoire de la définition des sacrements au XII^e siècle," Mélanges Mandenot II, 79-96. Paris, 1930.
- _____. Pour l'histoire du mot sacramentum. Louvain, 1924.
- _____. Le mouvement théologique du XII^e siècle. Paris, 1948.
- _____. "The Sentences of Anselm of Laon and their Place in the Codification of Theology during the XIIth Century," The Irish Theological Quarterly 6(1911), 427-441.
- _____. "L'entrée d'essentia, substantia, et autres mots apparentes, dans le latin médiéval," Bulletin du Cange 16(1941), 77-112; 17(1942), 129-133.
- _____. Littérature latine au Moyen Age. 2 vols. Paris, 1939.
- De la Taille, M. Mystery of Faith. Paris, 1931.
- De Lubac, Henri. Corpus Mysticum: L'Eucharistie et l'Eglise au Moyen Age. Theologie No. 3. Paris, 1949.
- _____. Exégèse médiévale. 4 vols. Paris, 1959-1964.
- Denzinger, H. and A. Schonmetzer. Enchiridion Symbolorum Definitionum et Declarationum. Rome, 1963.
- Donegan, A. F. Saint Augustine and the Real Presence. Washington, D.C., 1952.
- Dugmore, C. W. The Mass and the English Reformers. London, 1958.
- Dumoutet, E. "La théologie de la eucharistie à la fin du XII^e siècle," Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age 18(1943-1945), 233.
- Dupont, J. "'Ceci est mon corps,' 'Ceci est mon sang'," Nouvelle Revue Théologique 80(1958), 1025-1041.
- Ebersolt, J. "Essai sur Bérenger de Tours et la controverse sacramentaire au XI^e siècle," Revue de l'histoire des religions 48(1903) 1-42; 137-181.
- Eliade, M. The Sacred and the Profane. New York, 1958.
- Endres, J. A. "Studien zur Geschichte der Frühscholastik. Berengar von Tours," Philosophie Jahrbuch 26(1913), 160-169.

Erdmann, C. "Gregor VII und Berengar v. Tours," Quellen und Forschungen aus ital. Archiv. u. Bibliotheken 28(1937-1938), 48-74.

Fahay, J. F. The Eucharistic Teaching of Ratramn of Corbie. Mundelein, Ill., 1951.

Feret, H. M. "'Sacramentum Res' dans la langue théologique de S. Augustin," Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques 29(1940), 218-243.

Fessard, G. La dialectique des exercices spirituels de saint Ignace de Loyola. Theologie No. 35. Paris, 1956.

Fliche, A. La réforme grégorienne et la reconquête chrétienne. Vol. 8 of Histoire de l'Eglise ed. by A. Fliche and V. Martin. Paris, 1950.

Forest, A. and V. Steenberghen. Le mouvement doctrinal du IX^e au XIV^e siècle. Vol. 13 of Histoire de l'Eglise ed. by A. Fliche and V. Martin. Paris, 1951.

Galot, J. "Theology of the eucharistic presence," Review for Religious 22(1963), 407-429.

Geiselmann, J. Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik. Vol. 15 of Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur und Dogmengeschichte ed. by A. Ehrhard and J. P. Kirsch. Paderborn, 1926.

_____. "Ein neu entdecktes Werk Berengars von Tours über das Abendmahl," Theologische Quartalschrift 118(1937), 1-31; 133-172.

Ghysens, G. "Présence réelle et transsubstantiation dans les définitions de l'Eglise Catholique," Irenikon 32(1959), 420-435.

Gilson, E. Being and Some Philosophers. New York, 1952.

_____. The Christian Philosophy of Saint Augustine. New York, 1960.

_____. History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages. New York, 1955.

_____. Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages. New York, 1938.

_____. The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy. New York, 1940.

_____. The Unity of Philosophical Experience. New York, 1937.

Gore, C. The Body of Christ. London, 1902.

_____. Dissertations. London, 1895.

Grabmann, M. Die Geschichte der Scholastischen Methode. Freiburg, 1909.

Green, H. B. "The Eucharistic Presence: Change and/or Signification," The Downside Review 83(1965), 32.

- Guittou, M. The Problem of Jesus. New York, 1955.
- Gutwenger, E. "Substanz und Akzidenz in der Eucharistielehre," Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie 83(1961), 257-306.
- Haring, N. M. "A Study in the Sacramentology of Alger of Liège," Mediaeval Studies 20(1958), 41-78.
- _____. "Berengar's Definitions of Sacramentum and their Influence on Mediaeval Sacramentology," Mediaeval Studies 10(1948), 109-146.
- _____. "Character, Signum and Signaculum. Der Weg von Petrus Damiani bis zur eigentlichen Aufnahme in die Sakramentenlehre im 12. Jahrhundert," Scholastik 30(1955), 481-512; 31(1956), 41-69.
- Haskins, C. H. The Renaissance of the 12th Century. New York, 1963.
- Haureau, B. De la philosophie scolastique. 2 vols. Paris, 1850.
- Hefele, J. and H. Leclercq. Histoire des Conciles d'après les Documents Originaux. T. 4; 5., Paris, 1911; 1912.
- Heitz, Th. Essai historique sur les rapports entre la philosophie et la foi, de Bérenger de Tours à D. Thomas d'Aquin. Paris, 1909.
- Hurtevent, R. Durand de Troarn et les origines de l'hérésie bérengarienne. Paris, 1912.
- Hodl, L. "Sacramentum et res--Zeichen und Bezeichnetes. Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Arbeit zum frühscholastischen Eucharistietraktat," Scholastik 38(1963), 161-182.
- _____. "Der Transsubstantiationsbegriff in der scholastischen Theologie des 12. Jahrhunderts," Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale 31(1964), 230-259.
- _____. "Die 'Confessio Berengarii' von 1059," Scholastik 37(1962), 370-394.
- Helbeck, F. Der Eucharistische und der Mystische Leib Christi, in ihren Beziehungen zueinander nach der Lehre der Frühscholastik. Rome, 1941.
- Jacquin, M. "Le 'De Corpore et Sanguine Domini' de Pascale Radbert," Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques 8(1914), 81-103.
- Jansen, F. "Eucharistiques (accidents)," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique 5, 1368-1452.
- Jong, J. P. de. "Die Eucharistie als symbolische Wirklichkeit," Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 87(1965), 313-317.
- Knowles, D. The Evolution of Medieval Thought. New York, 1964.

- Laistner, M. L. W. The Intellectual Heritage of the Early Middle Ages. New York, 1957.
- Landgraf, A. "Studien zur Theologie des zwölften Jahrhunderts," Traditio 1(1943), 183-222.
- _____. Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik. 4 vols. Munich, 1956.
- Lanversin, F. de. "La présence eucharistique," Recherches de Science Religieuse 23(1933), 176-196.
- _____. "Le concept de présence et quelques-unes de ses applications," Recherches de Science Religieuse 23(1933), 58-80.
- Lavorel, L. "Oblats et corps du Christ sur l'autel d'après saint Ambrose," Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale 24(1957), 205-224.
- Leclercq, J. The Love of Learning and the Desire for God. New York, 1961.
- Leenhardt, J. Ceci est mon corps. Paris, 1955.
- Lottin, D. Psychologie et morale au XII^e siècles. Louvain, 1954.
- Macdonald, A. J. Lanfranc: a study of his life, work, and writing. Oxford, 1926.
- _____. Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine. London, 1930.
- Mansi, J. D. Sacrorum Concilium Nova et Amplissima Collectio. T. 19; 20. 1774; 1775.
- Martène, E. and U. Durand. Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum. T. 1; 4. Paris, 1717.
- Matronola, M. Un testo inedito di Berengario di Tours et il concilio romano del 1079 (Orbis romanus 6). Milan, 1936.
- McCabe, H. "The Real Presence," Clergy Review 49(1964), 749-759.
- McCracken, G. E., ed. Early Medieval Theology. Library of Christian Classics. Vol. 9. Philadelphia, 1957.
- Mersch, E. Le corps mystique du Christ. Etudes de théologie historique. Paris, 1951.
- Meyvaert, P. "Béranger de Tours contre Alberic du Mont-Cassin," Revue bénédictine 70(1960), 324-332.
- Möller, J. "De transsubstantiatie," Nederlandse Katholieke Stemmen 56(1960), 2-14.

Montcheuil, Y. de. "La raison de la permanence du Christ sous les espèces eucharistiques d'après Benaventure et Thomas," Mélanges Théologiques, 71-82. Paris, 1946.

Morel, P. B. Le Signe sacré. Paris, 1959.

Morin, G. "Béranger contre Bérenger. Un document inédit des luttes théologiques du XI^e siècle," Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale 4(1932), 109-133.

Moureux, J. The Meaning of Man. New York, 1961.

O'Neill, C. "What is 'Transignification' All About?" The Catholic World 202(1966), 204-211.

Palmer, Paul F. Sacraments and Worship. Westminster, Md., 1955.

_____. "The Theology of the Res et Sacramentum," in Readings in Sacramental Theology ed. by C. S. Sullivan. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964.

Paul VI. Encyclical letter Mysterium Fidei. Acta Apostolicae Sedis 57(1965), 766. Eng. tr. by National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C., 1965.

Peltier, A. Pascale Radbert, Abbé de Corbie. Amiens, 1938.

_____. "Radbert (Pascale)," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique 13, 1628-1639.

_____. "Ratramne," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique 13, 1780-1787.

Powers, J. M. "Mysterium Fidei and the Theology of the Eucharist," Worship 40(1966), 17-35.

Quasten, J. Patrology. 3 vols. Westminster, Md., 1964.

Rahner, K. The Church and the Sacraments. New York, 1963.

_____. "Die Gegenwart Christi im Sakrament des Herrenmahles," Schriften zur Theologie 4, 357-385.

Ramirez, L. La controversia eucharistica del s. XI. Berengario de Tours a la luz de sus contemporaneos. Bogota, 1940.

Redmond, R. P. Berengar and the Development of Eucharistic Doctrine. Newcastle, 1934.

Richardson, C. C. "Cranmer and the Analysis of Eucharistic Doctrine," Journal of Theological Studies 16(1965), 421-437.

- Robinson, J. A. T. The Body. London, 1952.
- Sarano, J. The Meaning of the Body. Philadelphia, 1966.
- Schanz, J. P. The Sacraments of Life and Worship. Milwaukee, 1966.
- Schaughnessy, P. The eucharistic doctrine of Guitmond of Aversa. Rome, 1938.
- Schillebeeckx, E. Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God. New York, 1963.
- _____. "Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration," Worship, 40(1966), 324-338.
- Schiltz, E. "Le problème théologique du corps du Christ dans la mort," Divus Thomas 38(1935), 361-378; 481-501.
- Schmitzer, J. Berengar von Tours: sein Leben und seine Lehre. Stuttgart, 1892.
- Schoonenberg, P. "Christ's Eucharistic Presence," Chicago Studies 5(1966), 135-152.
- Selvaggi, F. "Realta fisica e sostanza sensibile nella dottrina eucaristica," Gregorianum 37(1956), 16-33.
- Sheedy, C. E. The eucharistic controversy of the eleventh century against the background of pre-scholastic theology. Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology, 2nd series, No. 4. Washington, D. C., 1947.
- Sloyan, G. S. "Debate on the Eucharist," Commonweal 84(1966), 357-361.
- Smalley, B. Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages. Oxford, 1941.
- _____. "La Glossa Ordinaria. Quelques prédecesseurs d'Anselme de Laon," Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale 9(1937), 365-400.
- Smits, L. "Van oude naar nieuwe transsubstantiatieleer," De Heraut 95(1964), 330-344.
- Southern, R. W. The Making of the Middle Ages. New Haven, Conn., 1953.
- _____. "Lanfranc of Bec and Berengar of Tours," in Studies in Medieval History presented to F. M. Powicke. Oxford, 1948.
- Sudendorf, H. Berengarius Turenensis oder eine Sammlung Ihn betreffender Briefe. Hamburg, 1850.
- Taylor, A. E. Plato, the Man and his Work. London, 1926.

Thurian, M. L'Eucharistie. Paris, 1959.

_____. "Toward a Renewal of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation," in Christianity Divided ed. by D. J. Callahan. New York, 1961.

_____. The Eucharistic Memorial. Richmond, 1960-1961.

_____. "The Real Presence," in Christianity Divided ed. by D. J. Callahan. New York, 1961.

Tixeront, J. History of Dogmas. 3 vols. St. Louis, 1914.

Van den Eynde, D. "The theory of the composition of the sacraments in early scholasticism," Franciscan Studies 11(1951), 1-20; 117-144; 12(1952), 1-26.

_____. "Les définitions des sacrements pendant la première période de la théologie scolastique (1050-1240)," Antonianum 24(1949), 183-228; 439-488; 25(1950), 3-78.

Van der Leeuw, G. Religion in Essence and Manifestation. New York, 1933.

Vernet, F. "Eucharistie du IX^e à la fin du XI^e siècle," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique 5-2, 1209-1232.

_____. "Bérenger de Tours," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique 2, 722-742.

Weisweiler, H. "Die vollständige Kampfschrift Bernolds von St. Blasien gegen Berengar: De veritate corporis et sanguinis domini." Scholastik 12(1937), 58-93.

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee:

B. Cooke S.

Director

Paul Stockhausen, S.J.

W. Kelly S.

Richard Schneider.